

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1860.

---

ART. I.—1. *The Athenæum*, Nos. 1705, 1706, 1707.

2. *British Association for the Advancement of Science. Thirtieth Meeting, 1860. Journal of Sectional Proceedings from Wednesday, June 27th, to Wednesday, July 4th.* Printed under the superintendence of the Assistant General Secretary. By JAMES WRIGHT, Oxford.

3. *A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Act Sunday, July 1st, 1860.* By the Rev. F. TEMPLE, D.D. Oxford: J. H. and H. Parker.

THE late meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at the University of Oxford is, perhaps, an epoch of note in the history of both these bodies—the one errant, the other fixed. In one sense every meeting of such a character ought to be of higher interest than any which preceded it; since every discovery in knowledge makes further discoveries more easy; each mighty shade evoked by science carries a glass, like the spectre king in the play, ‘which shows us many more.’ But there is just now something more to be noted than the law of progress, by which new theories stimulate the registry of facts, and from which again start more theories, as we claim for this meeting a superior interest to any which has gone before. When any question has caught the minds of thinking and scientific men which has a line of intersection or a point of contact with the spiritual convictions or religious instincts of the greater mass alike of thinkers and thoughtless, there ‘arises no small stir about that’ question, even as when the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body first impinged upon the Greek intellect. Instantly there sets in a strong draught upon the flame which such meetings as those of the Association kindle. Now, those convictions or instincts *have* been lately stirred, perhaps ruffled, by the theory of the nature-world to which those views known generally as ‘Darwinian,’ are presumed to tend. Whether that tendency is legitimately ascribed to those

views is not, for the moment, our point, but the fact of its subjective existence has given a keen thrill of human interest to speculations conversant originally with the brute-world of matter and the infra-human instincts which guide its animal life.

Viewed with regard to any immediate results we might be inclined to think that these meetings, and this one in particular, seem to promise more than they could perform. Nay, in one sense, their value is in the inverse ratio to their interest at the moment. That which becomes of permanent value—and science knows no measure of a value which is not permanent—does so by leaving our intellect enriched by some ascertained conclusion. It is not the rise and sudden overspreading of the waters of intellect, but the fertilizing sediment which they bequeath which conveys a lasting treasure.

Now, let us suppose an unmapped and unfathomed chaos of phenomena waiting to be systematized. The keenest interest capable of being so excited lies not in the mere fact of their novelty or of their truth, but in the process of adjusting them to the other received and settled truths on which the mind habitually reposes. Are we thrown into a conscious state of conflict by their claims for admission? The parting with anything familiar for the sake of what is strange, is a process painful in proportion to the depth and earnestness of our nature. 'Who will change old lamps for new?'—the question of the disguised magician in the Eastern fairy tale—is often repeated now-a-days. 'The desire to clear up the relation between faith and science is almost universal in those who devote themselves to scientific investigation.' Dr. Temple is perhaps right. And there seem to arise two opposite dangers from the call thus often made, that of either shutting ourselves obstinately up against the light to avoid the trouble of adjudicating on the claims of what is new, and that of a loose way of viewing all claims as perhaps to a certain extent recognisable, but at the same time paying real homage to no truth whatever. Perhaps the process of inward recantation often repeated, of adherence carelessly given in and withdrawn, cannot be carried on without limit in the same individual without impairing the moral sensitiveness. When, however, a broad sweep at a current belief is made, there will always be many on whom the call to surrender what is old is made for the first time, and to whom it comes with a fresh and acute sensation. Of course, also, the question will needs occur, —not so often, however, to the vendor of the new lamp as to the proprietor of the old,—can we not possess *both*, retaining the old and acquiring the new? Can we not reconcile the claims which, as abruptly enunciated, leave a sense of hopeless



clash? But whether the issue be one of protracted discord, or of balanced compromise, or of union and accord, a process has always to be gone through of intense interest to the seeker after truth, and which, to the Christian, who feels that the result to his own mind is not the whole thing to be considered, is enhanced by his profounder sense of higher and unseen realities. This is merely a new application of the old maxim regarding things which stir us actively, and those which excite only passive, however profound, impressions. It is not, then, the fixed and ascertained truth, however great its permanent value, which gives their peculiar interest to these and similar 'gatherings,' at such 'feasts' as those we have seen lately celebrated, because the truth, as such, however profound, may be passively received. It is their relation to a generally prevailing mental condition at the time; it is the degree in which the aggressive character predominates in propounded theories that makes their interest buoyant, even as things will be borne along by a torrent which would sink in a lake.

And in this aspect the locality of this year's meeting bears a typical character, reflective of this very condition of interest. The very site and scene of this struggle between the propounded novelty and the treasured antiquity was that city, which, of all existing aggregates of mind and matter, is the fittest representative of a past living on in the present which has grown out of it, not been founded on its ruin. The 'schools' seemed to be themselves in a state of siege, typified by the position taken up by a large piece of ordnance, which Captain Blakesley had imported thither, in the middle of their frowning 'quadri-lateral;' or rather, the fatal horse had been, in the form of sections D and E, received within the walls; and the sensation, unfounded, let us hope,

'——— fuimus Troës, fuit Ilium et ingens  
Gloria Teucrorum,'

seemed uppermost in the minds of some of the garrison. Admitting that the prime interest of their meeting lay in adjusting the relation between the old and the new, the Association had certainly chosen representative ground.

We say that such meetings, however, as a general rule, seem to promise more than they perform. They draw out the antagonism of the question in a personal form by virtue of the presence and the living words of thinkers and speakers; unfortunately it does not often happen that the thinkers speak or the speakers think. Here is the great difficulty. With great respect for the names, many of them of the highest eminence, of those who took leading parts in the proceedings, it is difficult in a moment

to pass from the profound to the popular. Men who enjoy an audience cannot easily refrain from yielding to the sympathy which its presence begets in them. They are led rather by the unconscious tact of the orator than by any design of the sophist, to appeal to feelings which they know are salient and lively, to finger some chord which they feel will vibrate. Thus the conclusion which they establish may be true, but is not established by a worthy proof; they do not place it on its true grounds; they do not give such arguments as the subject admits of and demands, but such as the hearers then and there are capable of appreciating. The hearers are not at their highest pitch of reflective power; they come to the room excited, and their excitement rises with debate. Many of them, perhaps the majority, are capable of distinguishing between what they have heard and accepted thus in public and in a mixed assembly, and what approves itself to their resettled minds in sober and solitary afterthought. Where the question is practical, *e.g.* where public measures have to be taken by a public body, the evil is inherent in the nature of things, though there it has many valuable forms of reaction against other evils; but where the question can only operate on practice through some other theory or dogma, which, if affirmed, it must discredit, its sifting should be purely intellectual, and the mere loose shake which can be given it even in section D does not further this. Indeed it is idle to think that any settlement of it can be made, or any real step towards such settlement taken, in a room packed, even at Oxford, by a majority at twenty shillings a head.

Yet though this is enough to show the inconclusive character of discussions on the broad and popular side, where the arguments which command the greatest weight of assent are always the least profound and the most plausible, yet there is not wanting a wholesome sprinkling of intellects really trained in the subject-matter under debate, and a large supply of that most valuable power in a mixed audience, that of minds of high general culture, and wide information on various subjects, able often wisely to suspect, even where they cannot venture to affirm or deny, and on the basis of trained common sense, corrective of the extravagancies of theorists and professionals. To the picked pioneers of scientific observation, however, such meetings probably afford higher gratification than anything which the world of mind or even matter to them could furnish. No rock-tapping solitary, the 'Old Mortality' of extinct races, can enjoy, from the unlocking of the rock's hidden treasures, the reconstitution of a skeleton, or the completion of a species, such delight as in reading to the collected

representatives of the world of *savans* the paper which records and diffuses the travail of his hammer and the toil of his brain. Men of the first mark in every walk of theoretic thought must have their compeers. Hidden streams emerge mutually to light, and join. Those who have been to each other but the *nominis umbra* projected by fame across the ocean, may now meet face to face as sympathising friends or antagonists of prowess and renown. And, certainly, apart from any other results of this intellectual tournament, in which the pass is held by successive scientific adventurers against all comers, the keen strange pleasure which gladdens the hearts of these brethren of the scattered order of thought, is in itself worth no small price as a stimulant to exertion and a reward of activity. The interests of science assert their 'solidarity.' A man who has wrought in some retired cell of the comb feels that he cannot perish unknown; and this thought of itself sustains a weight of labour, and prompts to efforts that would not else have seemed worth while.

On the whole, so far as the proceedings of the Association have yet been published, or as individual attestations can enable us to decide such a question, there does not seem to be much mere whipping of tops or riding of hobbies—not much of what is mere frivolous and superficial guessing, or of what is merely the forging anew of some antiquated crotchet, interesting only to the propounder. The contributions, whatever their relative value, have been genuine of their kind, and appear to be the fruits of a love for the special subject and leisure to follow it. The difficulty on the part of the sectional committees must have mostly taken the form of the question, how to get rid of the abundance of contributions which encumbered their time and embarrassed their choice, without giving needless offence to the ardent volunteers who offered them.

At the same time there is one remark which we think applicable to all such research; and that is, that no lover of truth is ever retarded in his pursuit of it from reverence of mind. Reverence is a humility in expressions which relate to superhuman persons or things, a mental attitude of deference for such wisdom as exists in the world, but not of it; wisdom from some higher source than the mind of the inquirer. No one could, save on the assumption that there is not in the universe which he studies anything grander, nobler, or loftier, whether morally or intellectually, than himself, be justified in irreverence.

'Let knowledge grow from more to more,  
But more of reverence in us dwell;  
That mind and soul, according well,  
May make one music as before.'

The question may of course always be raised whether deference be due to any special dictum, or how far reverence can be claimed for this or that authority. But even a bare Deist should revere God in His works,—nay, a Deist might be fairly expected to be more devotionally moved as he contemplates them than a Christian; for to the Deist there is nothing greater, as a proof of Wisdom and Goodness, than the mere *works* of creation. Hence, the devotional feelings, so far as they are capable of being excited in him, are not, as in the case of a Christian, to any extent pre-occupied by the greater marvels of Wisdom and Goodness which Revelation unfolds. Beyond this, even taking the case of the superstitious reverence of others for that which has no awe for us, there is, firstly, the question how far they may possibly be right, and we may possibly be wrong; secondly, the question whether there be not some higher truth held in common by both, though superstitiously by them, which may be compromised by an irreverent dealing even with that which is purely superstitious. An example of this often occurs in the modes of speech which many of divers Protestant communions allow themselves with regard to the Virgin Mary. Thirdly, besides the question as relates to truth, there is to be considered the habit of mind which the exercise of reverential feeling engenders, and the opposite one produced by the exercise of its opposite. No one, surely, need be afraid of reverence where the most awful questions which can stir human thought are either under debate, or by implication involved—those, viz., which relate to man's own nature, or to the Divine. And yet here it is possible so to conduct research, or to manage controversy, as to gradually wean one's own mind from all reverential habit. Fourthly, as regards the issue of any particular dispute to the persons concerned, there is the question whether such a prejudice may not be inspired by irreverent handling as very much to retard the process of conviction, and to quicken the growth of partisanship and personal animosity. The last consideration belongs, indeed, rather to the courtesies of controversy; and, wherever it is conducted in a well-bred spirit, to waive the higher ground of reverence, the wish not to pain needlessly another's feelings, will guard against the mischief of such irreverence. We regret to have observed occasionally, in the discussions of more than one section, a tone of acrimonious exultation—of so called 'science' rejoicing against 'authority.' If there be, as some disciples of 'science' complain, a stubborn defence of untenable positions, on the part of the champions of authority, the tendency is only too likely to be increased by such an attitude on the other side. Besides, it ought to be observed, that the case is not equal to the two parties. For instance: *A* is an

ardent believer, whose theological creed, as he holds it, has taken up into itself, perhaps unwarrantably, a certain dogmatism concerning historical events or matters related to physical science. *B* is a roving explorer of loose convictions, and whose feelings, dull to all the vexed questions of theology, are keenly alive to the number of vertebræ in a pigeon, or the arrangement of corals in a bed of lias. He is utterly careless on whose toes the march of 'science' may tread. He enjoys the pursuit of knowledge; and if a favourite theorem be ultimately overthrown, he has yet had his reward in the ingenuity exercised in constructing and propounding it. But to the other man a cherished dogma uprooted is like an old tooth drawn, which pains and mutilates. He feels that certain tenets are to him of vital importance; that in them to live, and for them, if need be, to die, is the highest destiny of a moral creature. And with them he, perhaps wrongly, associates certain other propositions which his 'scientific' friend claims to have upset. He thinks—possibly may be mistaken in thinking—that the latter and the former must stand or fall together. And so he struggles hard for both, and endeavours to defend both approaches to the sanctuary which he deems imperilled. His anxiety is to his cool friend intensely amusing, who watches his efforts as a schoolboy does the frantic cackling of a hen on the edge of a pool, where the ducklings which she has hatched are enjoying their element. His mistake costs him much,—the error of him who has miscounted the vertebræ of an animal, or mistaken the habitat of a plant, costs him little. Who would die for a 'tittlebatian theory'? Where is the martyr of the 'undulatory' or 'corpuscular' school? Would Professor Huxley, though his philanthropy may extend to certain cages in the Zoological gardens, stand even an hour in the pillory for all the reptiles of both the red sandstones, or for all the wonders in a drop of dirty water? Galileo, indeed, whispering an 'aside,' *E pur si muove*, with conscious humour, recanted his recantation; but still, on the faith of that recantation, he was released. Galileo was in the right; and why? Because to suffer for a doctrine of physical science, which, if true, will surely prove itself, and which, when proved, leaves mankind none the better for its truth, would be not only simply absurd, but infinitely more absurd than was persecution for the sake of it. Show that not merely it is true, but that the acceptance of the truth is a moral duty, and sufferers for it will not be wanting. Otherwise, to suffer for it enforces no lesson, and leaves both mankind and the doctrine just where each was before. This shows how utterly unequal is the case between the man who thinks mistakenly that some tenet of his religion has a vital relation with a

physical or historical theory, and the man who is merely a physical or historical theorist, and in such matters, with Dr. Hooker, 'knows no creed.'

This is the difference to which Dr. Temple alludes without a due homage to its importance, when he says in the sermon preached during the meeting of the association:—'The student of science now feels himself bound by the interests of truth, and can admit no other obligation. And if he be a religious man, he believes that both books, the book of Nature and the book of Revelation, come alike from God, and that he *has no more right to refuse to accept what he finds in the one than what he finds in the other*. The two books are indeed on totally different subjects; the one may be called a treatise on physics and mathematics, the other a treatise on theology and morals. But they are both by the same author, and the difference in their importance is derived from the difference in their matter, and not from any difference in their authority.'

The passage which is italicised in the above extract contains the sophism lurking in the popular assertion of 'scientific' claims. Now; it may be safely maintained that no man need be required to maintain or to accept any theory whatever on physical subjects. It is always possible, without transgressing a law of our nature, to remain simply neutral on such questions; it is impossible so to remain on questions of theology or of morals. This is again, like the test of martyrdom, a proof crucial, which precipitates the hay and stubble of such philosophical pretensions, and shows their perishable stuff in the light of man's ultimate responsibility. 'Geology, for instance,' the preacher continues, 'has already altered our conception of *a great part of the book of Genesis*' (a rather broad statement, since beyond certain verses of the first chapter it is not easy to see any relation between the subject and the book); but that depends on what conception we have formed, and how far we have accepted the assumed discoveries of geology. It is, we repeat, consistent with the position of a morally responsible being to say, 'I neither accept nor reject those assumed discoveries, I simply suspend all judgment on the question; I do not even feel obliged to investigate for myself the evidence on the subject, much less to accept the results of the investigations of others. The investigation of physical laws, and the comparison of them with revelation, may be a high privilege, but can never be a duty.' There is nothing in such an abstinence from opinion, however obstinate it be, which can be compared to the false position of a sceptic in matters of theology or morals, in which

'quod magis ad nos  
Pertinet, et nescire malum est, agitamus.'



We 'have a right' in the one case which 'in the other' we have *not*; however one-sided or timidly scrupulous a mind it might show to exercise that right with uniform one-sidedness.

But a fact of greater weight is that much of this high-flown talk about 'science' and 'truth' is merely so much dabbling with theory and conjecture under grand names. The advance of science in matters which can possibly bear upon biblical statements, appears to open with every stride a far wider conscious area of ignorance than of knowledge. A century may probably upset much of what now is viewed as 'science,' and dissipate it into scio'ism. Have we a fair sample of the earth's whole crust? have we the where with to analyse its formation in detail? can we be said to have reached to structural laws which, by their simplicity, approve themselves as final? Many, no doubt, are ready to shout a rapturous affirmative to all such questions. But again, are there not vast fluctuations of opinion among 'scientific' men; have we not recently seen earthquakes of debate, chasms of difference, upheavals and displacements of vast surfaces of theory? Unfortunately it is as easy for one man to dogmatise as for a school of Thomists or a catena of divines. There is much to be said on the side of him who waits, and says, 'if I am alive and of sound mind a century hence, I will endeavour to tell you.' This is a consideration which gains force when we mark how very unequal is often the evidence for different propositions, all of which their advocates appear to regard as established with equal conclusiveness. It may be blind obstinacy to doubt the circulation of the blood or the law of gravitation, but we may be permitted to demur to swallowing the conclusions current under the names of Buckle and Darwin. It is a new fashion to dignify by the name of science a crude medley of fact and theory which may possibly some day be sifted and digested, and of which what is worthless may be purged off, and what is sound remain.

And however weak, vapid, or foolish a book may be, let it contain but a smart attack on any statement contained in or supposed to be proveable out of Scripture, and it will at once command a larger share of attention than a book of the same intellectual mark on any other question. If it be clever but flimsy, its talent will be puffed, and its weakness extenuated. There are people who would read eagerly a treatise on the philosopher's stone if it contained also an attack upon the inspiration of one of the minor prophets. Of course such a book as is venomous and yet current, like a mad dog, may and will have its run and die out, but that debt of nature is not paid till it has done much harm. Thus, whoso will, may beguile his leisure by founding monstrous theories on loose, shift, and vaporous

drifts of fact; and having thus begotten a Centaur on a cloud, may parade it as a Pegasus in the face of an admiring public.

But without being of a weak, vapid, or venomous character, even when the author is gravely bent on the pursuit of truth, such is the state of human knowledge on those physical questions which are most agitated, that the most uncertain statements are hazarded with the pretensions of discoveries, and announced as 'laws,' to the canon of which whatever has hitherto possessed a hold over men's minds must conform. This combative self-assertion proceeds probably from the less worthy but the more noisy section of the pioneers of knowledge, but still the fashion is to assume generally that the result of one's own investigations is 'truth,' and if any one else differs, however venerable the prescription which his opinions enjoy, so much the worse for him and for all the grounds on which he relies:

'To observations which ourselves we make  
We grow more partial for the observer's sake;'

and the measure of modest probability which ought at most to attach to such hypotheses, is puffed into a conclusion of dogmatic finality—at least as regards the 'revelation' which they are assumed to supersede.

But especially round the domain of ethnology—that wide and transcendental horizon of historic research—there floats a quagmire of questions which deeply affect revealed statements concerning the origin of mankind. These have by no means the same degree of relation to all such scriptural topics as they relate to, but all stand in a closer relation to such than any theories of the mere physical universe can do. History and religion, or ethnology and revelation, deal with the same subject matter, man. Revelation must include a statement of what man was, in order to account for what he is, and to explain what he will hereafter be. Revelation and ethnology have each their own canons, tests, and authorities, beyond which each alike knows no appeal. We are reminded of the claims of temporal and spiritual jurisdiction, each distinguishable in theory, but coinciding in the same subject-matter, and refusing any separate adjustment. Thus, the theory of Bunsen ascribes a great antiquity to mankind, whereas the calculable data of Scripture, assuming their genuineness, allow one much less limited. Again, other theorists have left the question at present to fluctuate between this theory of high antiquity and another of a multiple human stock. If, say they, man cannot be allowed 20,000 years for diffusion, we must assume many simultaneous points of departure. This latter theory would people every river-basin or plateau from a distinct primitive ancestry of man. An instinc-

tive consciousness of recognition seems to us to forbid the notion of any such absence of kin between race and race. 'A man and a brother' suggests a feeling which furnishes a passport through all diversities of skin, language, and stature, and which resembles that happy freemasonry of the canine race, which makes all, whether spaniel, bull, cur or turnspit, dogs and brethren. But that there is a teaching of Scripture on this subject of human descent, and that its dictum is as strongly and plainly against a plurality of Adams as language can make it, needs hardly be stated here. The only superficial fact in the history of mankind with which it tallies is the common claim of indigenous up-spring from the earth, put forth by every nation whose pedigree transcends recorded time—the natural self-assertion of ignorance, worth about as much as the 'specters I grewed' of Topsy in the tale of 'Uncle Tom.'

Nor is the fact of single-stemmed unity one of bare historical significance, it has the closest relation to our spiritual estate as Christians. All mankind are so clearly the scope of the Gospel that no one could for a moment on Scriptural grounds reject Hottentot or Kaffre on account of inferiority of organization arguing descent from some meaner stock than that of which Christ came. Beyond this, the co-extensiveness of the Promise with the universal need of man, is based upon the correspondent unity between 'the first' and 'the second Adam.' Its golden cord is reeved as it were through this eyelet-hole, the unity of blood among all 'nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues.'

The greatest stay of ethnological research is of course the study of languages, the modern, the dead, the fossil; but through all the research this maxim must be carried, unity may have existed, and be yet irretraceable, but if it be traceable, it must have existed. There may be differences enormously large between languages yet really akin, and chasms which we cannot fill up may separate branches ultimately related. It may be observed that the 'principle of selection,' as traced by Mr. Darwin, so far as it has any weight, is in favour of the original unity of the human stock. Thus languages, diverging from one stem may be conceived to have become permanent in some selected type, while many other inferior dialectic varieties may have become extinct. The question what degree of estrangement languages so related may sustain, is one of great obscurity; nor is there perhaps any standard by which we can measure that degree. Whether this obscurity will ever be dispelled, or to any important extent mitigated, it would be extremely rash to pronounce. But in this state of the problem there are some who love the quicksand, and cannot wait for the rock to be laid bare. Their genius is so strongly constructive, and their

mental agility so great, that construct a theory they must, and the ground which can be most imperceptibly shifted suits best their display of intellectual gymnastic. On the question at issue real evidence is very scarce; the learning extinct languages is not a work of certainty or ease, every such language discovered complicates the problem, opening a demand for more new analogies to elucidate it, and starting many subordinate tracks of distinct enquiry. Human life passes away, and the feeble gleaner in this overwhelming field leaves a poor little sheaf of generalization amidst the endless dry stubble of facts. Of course a point in the problem may exist beyond which the terms in the series, as it were, converge, and after reaching which further explorers will find difficulties turned into facilities. But who can assure us that we can ever mount so far above existing landmarks as to reach it?

Whilst touching on the question of ethnology in relation to language, it may interest some if we notice, in passing, an attack on the 'Indo-Germanic Theory,' volunteered by the President of the London Ethnological Association. Even elsewhere the name of Professor Max Müller is so fully identified with the maintenance of this theory, that his championship of the question wherever raised might have been assumed, but in Oxford it was justly viewed as a direct challenge to him to appear and reply; which, however, he was prevented by peremptory official duties in London from doing. His letter, read by the President of the Section, acknowledged the call, and perhaps implied a promise to answer; but emphatically added that he should as soon have expected to hear the Copernican Theory of the earth's revolution round the sun called in question, as that of the Indo-Germanic Stock. The paper in attack was necessarily reduced to conclusions, the chain of argument, or number of examples adduced in support of which were suppressed, in deference to the rule of time allowed,—a rule without which the institution would speedily become unmanageable, but which, perhaps, operated unfavourably to the reasonings of the assailant. He sought to invalidate the presumption in favour of Indo-Germanic unity, derived from the accordance between all words in the various languages of that stock, which express the paternal and maternal relations. These, it was urged, were merely the natural syllabifications common to infant lips, and, being the first sounds of which their imperfect utterance was capable, were uniformly appropriated to express the first familiar objects. But the lecturer forgot to explain how it was that Malay and Mongolian infants have a different syllabification from those of the races named Indo-Germanic; as on this supposition they must, one would think, have become the bases of a world-wide pair

of appellatives. Why is the vocal organization of other races so different? And, if it be, is not this of itself a stronger argument in favour of the affinity and the difference than any mere distinction of arbitrarily invented sounds? The Indo-Germanic side was ably sustained by Professor Jarret of Cambridge and by Professor Rawlinson and Dr. Scott of Oxford, a weight of scholarship against which the objector having indeed no seconder, was unable to make any significant reply. The argument, however, which searched the map of Europe for various recondite races, such as the Laps, Finns, and Basques, was, from the high scholastic celebrity of those who mingled in it, more interesting, perhaps, on grounds of philology, than any discussion which took place at this meeting. But, owing of course to the flood of scholarship which would otherwise overwhelm the association, a strict check is necessarily imposed on all that is purely or directly philological. Even after allowing every possible abatement, in consideration of the somewhat dismembered and unsupported condition of the arguments adduced against the Indo-Germanic theory, a heavy preponderance in the discussion must be allowed to have rested with its defenders. And the audience would probably gather the most decisive presumption in its favour from the fact that only so very slender an array of probabilities, as was adduced, could be mustered against it.

But on the general question, affecting not a group of related races but the entire human stock, other evidence has lately been put in, in the form of alleged discoveries of human remains, especially flints fashioned by the hand of man, found amongst palæozoic deposits. On the question of a plurality of origin, this could only have an indirect influence, but on that of the antiquity of man a wide door is opened to discussion. There is, however, the previous consideration of the said flints being coeval or not with the remains among which they lie, to be disposed of, and on this a curious light was thrown by some recent discussions in Sect. E at this year's meeting of the British Association. On Tuesday the 3d of July, papers were read by Captain Sir Edward Belcher, 'On the manufacture of Stone Hatchets and other Implements by the Esquimaux,' and by Dr. James Hunt, 'On the Antiquity of the Human Race.' The former paper was full of the rare interest which attaches to tales of wild scenes and tribes amongst which the narrator's own footprints have fallen. Sir Edward's presence and manner were even more suggestive than his recitals, for they made the hearers feel somewhat of how the heart of an arctic expedition was sustained by the cheerful vigour of a simple character, the story portraying, unconsciously and incidentally, the man.

But, although nothing which Sir E. Belcher said called for a dis-

cussion upon the antiquity of mankind, another member, a gallant admiral, found an easy transition from the flint arrow-heads of the Esquimaux to the 'celts' of a race supposed extinct, and known only to some of the most advanced speculators on palæontology. These 'celts,' if that be the right name for them, are flints which bear presumable indications of having been wrought by hand, whilst their location lies amid strata computed as being some geological ages earlier than the first appearance of our species.

We have already remarked on the fair complaint which may be laid against the loose talkers of such meetings as that which gives occasion to these pages. The case now adduced was one which completely justifies the remark, and exemplifies the mischief of maladroitness advocacy to a good cause. It makes one regret the small extent to which the power of lucid simple statement of a man's views, and the insight into occasion, generally prevails. The gallant geologist, lacking the discernment which enables a man

'ut jam nunc dicat, jam nunc debentia dici,'

rushed to meet, or rather to find an opponent whose turn was not yet come to appear; and his untimely zeal was at once more provoking and more amusing, inasmuch as that turn was exactly next on the list, in the paper of Dr. James Hunt above mentioned. Had the admiral reserved his broadside, he would have had an antagonist fairly alongside in another half hour, instead of which he blazed away across the bows of a friend at one who was out of reach. This had the effect ultimately of calling up the president, to whom, however, the admiral seemed at first disposed to show such obedience as Nelson showed Sir Hyde Parker at Copenhagen, when he kept his blind eye to the telescope which showed the signal of recal, and bade them 'keep his own for closer action flying.' It is not quite easy to catch the words of a speaker, the broken fervour of whose ejaculations shows more of feeling than of reasoning, but we believe that the malaprop champion did not subside till he had flourished what appeared to be a pocket-Bible in the face of the Section, proclaiming that '*that* was his guide-book,' or 'log-book,' or some other such title; by which he meant, doubtless, to convey an impression of his respect for the Sacred Volume, if such it was; but which was rather suggestive of the familiarity which is allied to an opposite feeling. On the whole, though sympathizing with his advocacy, had it not been so overspurred and broken-kneed, we confess to a grateful sensation of relief, that the admiral's fire had been drawn, and a mental murmur of *non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*, as he reluctantly succumbed to the chairman's decision.



Dr. James Hunt, however, 'following on the other side,' and being 'in order,' proceeded with the facts of flint blades found in or near the bed, we believe, of the Sambre, and likewise that of the Red or some other American river. The fact of their alluvial position was considered, however, by other eminent geologists present to be the key to their paradoxical relation to older remains, among which, as the balance of probability seemed to be, some water force had cast them. The situation reminded listeners of Edie Ochiltree's quiet remark, when the exulting Mr. Oldbuck has just fixed upon the supposed prætorium of Agricola, 'I mind the bigging o't.' But a ruder shock was given to Dr. James Hunt's theory by a Transatlantic geologist, who claimed some personal acquaintance with the mud beds of the Mississippi, to which, we believe, an appeal had been made as confirming the testimony wrested from other rivers. The wide delta of that immense basin is often seen offering its sweltering expanse of mud banks to the southern sun. On such occasions vast mud blisters, it seems, will form, swell, and puff, till the surface slime becomes, like a cup of cocoa cooling, covered with a rind, but one which is thick, leathery, and elastic. These mighty imposthumes are a great hindrance, by their presence or their consequences, to the navigation of the stream, and the federal government had incurred some expense in watching and operating on their slimy tumours. The custom, we believe, is to fire round shot into, or otherwise 'discuss' them with sufficient force; on which, or, eventually, merely by the gaseous pressure from within overcoming the resistance of the mud coat, the blister bursts, scattering its contents, organic and other, in confusion over the adjacent surface. Thus all order of stratification is lost, and any refuse tools of an Indian village may be tossed pell-mell with antlers and monumental bones, of every geologic age, lying near the banks or embedded in the bottom of the great river of the west. Of course, therefore, all reasoning which should treat the former as coeval with the latter would be based on an anachronism; or as a learned associate stated it, in *prim phrase*, appropriate, we suppose, however, to the occasion, 'the human and other remains were merely related in space, not in time.'

Thus the argument of Dr. Hunt, so far, was blasted and dispersed, even like a Mississippi mud-puff. An attempt, however, was made to restore its shaken validity by the explorer of a cavern not long ago lighted upon by a labourer near Torquay, who one day striking upon a slab of rock which rung hollow, was induced to follow up the blow till his curiosity found the way to a cavern containing, as proved on examination, a floor of stalactite, on which lay the usual horns, bones, &c., and

among or near them some wrought flints. The cave lay in a cliff, about a hundred feet above sea level, and was itself about seventy-five feet above the same, consequently at about twenty-five feet below the surface. A good deal of stress was laid on the fact of a leg of deer or bear being found with every bone *in situ*, on the absence from the cavern of all traces of the action of water, and on the elevation and direction of the greater axis of the cavern rendering such action impossible. There was no tradition of its having ever been previously entered, a circumstance which seems to be of no weight in such a neighbourhood, for the distance below the surface was not too great to make it likely that in the course of human ages it might have been known and used, and yet was great enough to have allowed it to be lost sight of and its memory obliterated in case of the concurrence of any natural convulsion with any great social change. There was no statement of any trace of human agency in closing the cavern, and its sealing must be presumed referable to purely natural causes. If the earthquake or landslide which sealed it had been followed speedily by a famine, a pestilence, a massacre, or a migration, all record might easily perish. Had the explorer been unluckily stricken with asphyxia or any form of sudden death on entering, and the action of the weather or a fresh convulsion closed the small aperture through which he entered, till his bones had time to fossilize (for which it is by no means certain that very vast periods are required, at least in favourable spots), and had the cavern then been rediscovered after that interval, how vastly strengthened would the argument for the antiquity of human remains have become! Here would have been a fossil human skeleton entire, with every bone *in situ*, sepulchred amid the *débris* of creatures supposed earlier by whole geological periods; here would have been a recovered specimen of palæozoic man! As it is, there are merely the flints to hang a theory on; and though the question how they got there is one of curious interest, yet, as compared with the solution which the theory would affirm, it is merely one of teachable importance. The whole argument suggested to a Pickwickian hearer a reminiscence of 'Bill Stumps, his mark.'

Perhaps, however, the most subtle danger to be apprehended from would-be votaries of so-called science is that which lurks in the abuse of the term 'law' as employed by certain theorists on the progress of human civilization, of whom Professor Draper, of the United States, was the representative at this meeting. That intellectual conditions follow physical organisation, and physical organisation the equilibrium of natural influences around it; that thus the advances of the man or of the nation, the one being a perfect reflex of the other, are due not to internal but

to external conditions,—in short, that all which we have been in the habit of regarding as the result of man's free-will is merely a function of base matter, is, we believe, no unjust statement of the theory newly afloat on the tide wave of speculation. There is an end then to speculation. If mind have no independence of matter, any thought, whatever be ultimately the resolution of the phantasm consciousness, is merely a vibration of a portion of matter. It can control no other molecule's vibration. Every quasi-thought is free, equal, and independent in everybody. Conviction, discussion, agreement or dissent, become non-entities; each is but a modified phantasm; all link and sequence of premiss and conclusion vanishes, all licit and illicit process in argument is quashed. What seemed arguing is but chasing the tide or whirling on the eddy of our cerebral molecules or nervous fluid. Professor Draper's eloquent tongue is but as the beat of a pendulum, the sensations of his hearers are best measured by the barometer; a theory, even the Darwinian, is but as the neat and elegant curve into which steel atoms are thrown by an electric current. Jove is dethroned and hubbub reigns; man is one of the flora that fade, or of the fauna that perish; he is a bubble, holding a little gas, that wells upwards from the centre of existence, to break and be no more.

We believe that the radical flaw in the argument which seems thus to crush all that thinks and acts into brute earth, lies in the abuse of the term 'law.' By way of illustrating his position that man, the nation or the unit, is but a seed, that can develop only under favourable circumstances, and then only in one direction, the Professor employs the figure of a round marble resting on a smooth flat table, which is at rest while the table so remains, and may so rest for centuries, but, as soon as the table tilts, must roll, and can then roll but in one given direction. And this is given us as an example of the law of *external* circumstances! As though the gravitation, by virtue of which the marble so rolls, were not as completely internal to the marble as it is external, acting in every molecule of its smaller mass as perfectly and as powerfully as in every molecule of the earth's larger one.

In the marble and in the earth the action of the force is homogeneous throughout every particle of either, and the illustration, being so simple, is useful wherever the case to be illustrated is one of a body or a system, the law internal and external to which is, wholly or so far, one. Still, even in the marble, it is untrue to speak of the force as being circumstantial merely. The same principle of gravitation may produce an effect which seems externally like, and may, where strictness of

argumentative truth is not needed, be used to illustrate that of a purely internal and independent force; thus Wordsworth speaks of

'The river winding at his own sweet will,'

where he describes an effect precisely similar to that of the marble on the table, the motion of which each fluid molecule follows; but what the poet meant is a conception directly the opposite of the latter. Wordsworth personifies the river, Professor Draper materializes man. But there is this difference,—the poet means what he says only in a figure, the professor supposes that he states a sober truth.

But in man, the individual or the nation, we assume the existence of an inward law *not* homogeneous with those which affect him externally, but wholly unlike them, and indeed a thing *per se*. There is not in the universe, as observed by us, anything like it; all our illustrations, therefore, fall far short of it; for the most trivial action of the mentally undeveloped child or the dimly perceptive idiot has more in common with the loftiest and grandest drama of history than the most sublime phenomenon or most widely diffused quality of physical things has with the feeblest inceptive attempt of a moral being to act. This was anciently acknowledged by the best, wisest, and greatest of the world. Wiser men, we suppose, have now arisen to enlighten later days, who think that by studying man in the mass they elicit something which overthrows the conclusions arrived at from the study of the individual. If man—the man—act from a law internal to himself, is it not at once absurd to say that man, the race or nation, is controlled by circumstances which are wholly external? May we not claim that the conclusions derived from the complex study be tested by some formula of verification derived from the earlier, the more trustworthy because the simpler, subject?

However, we assume that those whom Professor Draper represents suppose that, from the study of ages, races, periods, and phases of civilization, they have reached to facts which reduce man to the condition of the marble on the table. We will consider presently what amount of deference is due to that presumption, and meanwhile we only assert that the individual and the race must stand or fall together. If I who write these lines do so from some controlling force of external circumstances, no doubt all mankind who read or leave them unread are in the same predicament. If the boy who builds an oyster grotto has no internal law bidding him do it, then neither was any internal law involved in the building of Babylon or the organization of the Roman empire. The medium of proof by

which the collective race of man is made to react on the individual and overthrow his free agency, is the supposed establishment of 'laws.' For we assert conversely, that if men—the civilised constituted race—are but pellets in a pop-gun, moulded and propelled by some external force, then man, the constituent unit, is no better. What, then, is 'law?' It is the generalized expression of a fact which holds good in a multitude of instances. When we have reached to such a comprehensive estimate of all possible conditions of the fact as to be able to express the one condition under which it is always true, eliminating all in which it fails to be verified, we can give our law an universal statement, but even then we are as far from establishing a *cause* as ever. If, however, on the contrary, there be in the individual a cause which produces outward phenomena related to him, then we have made no further progress *qua* cause, in tracing the fact through any number of millions of instances. The law stated leaves us in the dark as regards the cause. You may prove that *A* is *B*, but that does not show why *A* exists. We derive from the study of concurrent qualities no insight into the real dependence of what we observe to exist. We get no nearer to a cause from a law than we do from a name. Given, that light is ponderable or imponderable, does that assist us as regards the cause of light? Law, in fact, is purely formal and expressional; the result of our own mind at work, observing, classifying, noting, and reducing natural phenomena to such a form as it can most easily grasp and wield. The multitude of singular facts which converge to and register themselves upon the observing difference-noting mind, write thereon a law; but that law, properly speaking, is subjective to the mind itself; all that is objective is the universal presence, in given objects, of the fact of which the law is the general expression. There is, at any rate, no proof that law has any existence save in the mind that conceives it. When, therefore, we use the common expression that God works by general laws, we only mean, in strictness of speech, that his operations take that form to our minds. He is still the cause, and the law is not even an interposed machinery between Him and the effect. And when a fact is observed to be universally present in a certain class of objects, the question causal remains both in the individual and in the class. If an individual man builds a house under certain circumstances, the fact that generation after generation of men, containing each its millions, build houses also under precisely similar circumstances, does not assist us to the cause of any one single house being built. We say that cause is to be found in the will of the individual builder. Professor Draper asserts, or, to be con-

sistent, should assert, that it is to be found in the external circumstances which he observes to coexist in every case. We say, you may lay down a law, if you will, that such and such actions are to be found under certain circumstances, but you do not thereby suggest a cause. If the choosing will, as we assert, be that cause in this or that man, the similar circumstances attending similar actions in other men, through an indefinite period, can never alter its being the cause, however many millions of times the circumstances may attend the actions. If there is in a higher sense than that of a mere generalization 'a law unto himself' within a man, nothing external can ever supersede or to the smallest extent qualify it; they are as distinct from each other as are argument and brute force, and must remain radically asunder whilst a thinking mind exists.

The argument is at bottom identical with that which was long ago condemned by the father of ethical philosophy, the fallacy of those who lay the blame of vicious actions on external things and not on a man's self as being easily attracted by them. 'Men are caught by pleasure as fish by the hook,' but those who thus are made a prey have first enfeebled by vicious habit their power of choosing. But what the old philosopher conceded, under this qualification, as true of the baser specimens of mankind, the modern professor appears to assert unconditionally of them all.

But there is a further fold of sophistry to be unravelled, one wheel of fallacy concentric within another. These 'laws' which, we are told, prescribe for man from without the march of civilization along lines from which he cannot deviate, are really nothing more than summaries based on the omission of details, average calculations which neglect extreme cases of divergence. But it is precisely on these deviations in detail that the problem crucially turns, and the average truths, often propounded with confident wisdom, may as probably as not be wholesale falsehoods. In order to establish this statement, it must be remembered that superior practical wisdom is what qualifies men for the social advantages evolved by the growth of political society, to which the name of civilization is given. This wisdom shows itself in various forms; the pliable ingenuity of the Frenchman, the dry and dogged craft of the Scot, foresight, endurance, enterprise, adventure, power of organization, all constitute it. The man, or the race, superior in these respects, will make the best of a situation, flourish where others have a bare existence, or thrive while others starve. Is it a strange thing that reasonable choice should lead men in closely similar circumstances to closely similar actions? Or does it



cease to be reasonable, or to be choice, because its results show on the whole a striking resemblance? On the other hand, it is precisely the deviations in detail, which the speculator neglects as trivialities unworthy of his philosophy, that vindicates the act in which the choice is shown as a result of independent energy. Compare a dozen Esquimaux villages with a dozen wasps' nests, and you will find in the latter that rounded off symmetry which makes every individual specimen an adequate type of the species, but not in the former. The wasp's nest ought to delight our philosopher most, for 'representative' men and 'typical' institutions please him; and whatever is redundant or abnormal he trims to terse rotundity with theoretic-shears. There will not be found about the wasp's nest any exaggerated individuality to demand the Procrustean stretcher; but in the village, differences in shape, size, ornamentation, and material, will offend the dictator of nature, which he will reduce by setting off one touch of salient grotesqueness against another, recognise only what they have in common, and neglect that in which they differ. This is like knocking off the noses of the twelve Cæsars in order to establish a family likeness between them. Thus in our theorist's eye that which is distinctive, individual and, in a word, human, will be discarded. He will divide the cubic contents of all the huts by the square of the number of squaws in each settlement, and be satisfied by establishing a 'law.'

But the most barefaced fraud of modern argument is that of averages. An average may be rigidly true which does not accord with a single individual case from all out of which it is gathered. We have only to imagine conflicting facts poised in opposite extremes in order to see the futility of any reasoning based on an average. Among a hundred individuals forty may be the average age, not one of whom is forty nor near it. It is no uncommon thing to find a concurrence of a low average with a high extreme in vital statistics. There may be assumptions conceivable which are safely based on the average in such cases, but their limit is obviously a very narrow one. Thus with regard to the connexion between the rate of marriages and the price of corn, we may allow the average a critical value, because there will be so many fewer marriages whenever that price rises ten shillings above the average as to counterbalance the so many more marriages whenever it falls to the same extent. This is merely an example of the general unity of result to which reasonable choice leads men in similar circumstances; but are all men thus prudent in their actions? Are there no rash marriages and starving families in consequence? Now, clearly, it was open to the reckless bachelor to take advice, and calculate,

before the fatal step, the number of mouths he would have to feed. He might have done as prudent men do. Society, however, much as it has to deplore on his account, acknowledges at any rate this obligation to him, that he has vindicated the acts of men from that monotony of prudence, which would countenance the dabbler in statistics in the notion that all men and things move, like 'navvies' and their barrows, along a plank which necessity has laid for them, and along which he can trace their rut.

Such are some of the reflections to which we were led by some of the more animated among the discussions, to which certain of the papers lately read at Oxford gave rise. It would be more courteous than correct to say that those discussions were uniformly conducted with a dispassionate absence of personality, such as should distinguish the debates of the friends of science. Over those personalities, however, faintly developed as they were, we gladly draw a veil. That which we wished had been wanting at the time, and from which no useful lesson can be learnt, is best not repeated afterwards.

It is enough that a learned professor thinks that there is no such thing as a bar sinister in nature, and that we might even archæologically connect the simiolatry of Egypt with the hero worship of ancestral greatness. As we hear of an additional vertebra having been gained in a pigeon's dorsal column by the grand principle of selection, we suppose that experiments will be made to test the possibility of a caudal continuation of the spine in *man*, by way of recurrence to what, on this hypothesis, is the early type of the race.

But the fact of encountering a modified 'Mcnboddo' theory on a platform of the British Association gives grave matter for thought. The men who say these things are not pompous charlatans, nor crotchety cavillers. They, perhaps, lack a guiding inward light, which leads us to repudiate such a theory as a sort of mental dallying with a thing abhorrent. They have not been fortified beforehand, and one-sided study does its work upon their mind. It seems as though there was indeed a tendency in the pursuit of physical phenomena, taken alone, to beguile the student, at any rate at certain incomplete stages of the progress in that pursuit, into materialism. But we have too much faith in all the works of God to suppose this the innate and proper tendency of their study. All truth must be ultimately one and coherent; there can be no real conflict between the Word of God and His works. And, doubtless, a want of faith in spirituality, when the whole attention is bestowed on things 'of earth earthy,' must ever tend to extinguish the belief and the hope that God is the origin of man's being in a

higher sense than He is that of fowl and brute, and not only the origin of man's being, but the aim and object of it. But till we reach the centre at which the scattered rays of truth combine, they may appear to throw doubt on each other, and present a maze of conflict which bewilders as we gaze. Meanwhile the hope of reconciling all truth in God ultimately, should make us reverent to His Word, and patient amidst His works; and the wanton theorist, who scatters loose hypotheses with a withering contempt of those who are trammelled, as he asserts, by preconceived opinions, not only misleads and injures the minds which accept his views, but begets a prejudice against philosophical speculation, and rouses unenlightened bigotry, armed with tenfold power, as the compensation of his flippancy. The working theory, which, as far as it goes, serves to explain phenomena, may be allowed the place of a scaffolding whilst the edifice of truth is being raised, but those who engage in this tentative process must not be allowed to boast as though their poles and rafters were a permanent edifice. There are thousands who love the clatter of new theories, who have not the power nor the wish to grapple fairly with what is propounded, but love, with a *suave mari magno* feeling, to contemplate the effects of a brisk, stirring breeze of speculation. They think by deputy, but embrace with full personal energy; though incapable of sifting what they take up in the way of opinion, or even weighing accurately any fact on which it seems to rest. Much less can they measure the chasm which separates the childish phantasm of the sciolist from the grave hypothesis in favour of which the weight of evidence pleads powerfully with the patient disciple, although he cannot yet accept it as approved. This chasm may be filled up by any indefinite number of more or less plausible hypotheses, for each of which something may be said. We cannot, perhaps, turn our backs upon them, but the temper in which they should be met is one of candour and caution, like suspicious acquaintances who may turn out honest men. Somewhere, we suspect, in this interval, should the Darwinian theory find place. The main question on behalf of which it yet desiderates proof, appears to be the amount of modification of which existing types of life are capable. On this, indeed, the whole theory seems to turn. That they are capable of some, every one would admit who has with even common curiosity watched the pigeon-house or the beehive; but there seem grave reasons for doubting whether this has at all a wide range. Probably the limits of possible modification may be much sooner reached than Mr. Darwin supposes, and it is even questionable whether there be in nature now the means of solving the question as to the modi-

fication possible at an earlier cosmological epoch. At all events, to amass whatever materials exist for approximating to a solution may probably be much more than the work of one man's lifetime; perhaps we may need centuries of patient pioneering before we can reach an elevation necessary to give us the required breadth of prospect over nature. The vastly greater differences which exist between the nearest of non-related varieties, and the most widely divergent of those which have a radical affinity, seem to indicate that a central fixity of type is the law of those species with which we are most familiar; a certain leaven of peculiarity appears to dwell and work amidst the opposite tendency towards fluctuation and change. Nor is either of these principles the less real because we cannot fix the limit of its working. Further, the very quality of susceptibility to physiological change in concurrence with physical circumstances, seems to be broadly stamped on some animals, and even still more largely upon some vegetables, whilst it but feebly characterizes others. Nowhere can we look for a uniform exemplification of this law. It may, however, be laid down that the more complex and highly organized a creature is, the more it is enabled to resist inroads made upon its type by external influences, and in such, save as regards the superficial circumstances of colouring matter of hair, skin, &c., no important modification takes place, so far as our observation extends. But as the higher organisms betray less susceptibility, so man, the highest of all, perhaps exhibits the least, save as regards those mere superficial tokens. The great resemblances and differences remain in ox, pig, dog, and dove, resemblances between cognates, and differences between heterogens. Or, if the opponent insists that this is but playing with words, and that our term 'cognition' is merely a compendious way of saying that between groups of creatures resemblances exist, still those resemblances and their corresponding differences abide uneliminated, so far as our experience goes, in the face of hostile circumstances, and amidst all the ingenious devices of naturalists to besiege them with modifying influences. Now, with a full view of these prime differences, can we suppose that they have been surmounted by development,—that races of creatures now thus permanently, it seems, differenced, were originally only divergent; that the dog, for instance, was once an offshoot of the fox, or both ramifications of some cynalopécic stock, which contained the element of either destined for later maturation? Why, then, can we not reproduce the mere cynalopex? The developed common element would seem not to be capable of offering any opposition to fecundity. It seems at any rate far more easy to accept, as cutting off the pos-

sibility of descent from a common stock, this broad bar which nature sets before all who would confuse the lines which she has traced, than to suppose such descent possible, and then to account for the impediment to sustained propagation. The question of hybrids may further suggest that it is not the forcing of a ticketed monstrosity to be the trophy of a museum which can ever prove a law of nature. The man of true science will never seek to make some successful warping of a law contribute to the establishment of what one step more shows to be unnatural. These pages are not a review of Mr. Darwin's book, but we may venture to record an opinion that he has not successfully grappled with this important question. Wherever distinct stocks are found capable of fusing in, and sustaining a hybrid race, we should be disposed to admit the possibility of their common descent, and in default of this to maintain the contrary. Two species mix in a hybrid. It forms no variety, but may exist within a wide local range, in a non-reproductive form, as largely as either primary type; but every specimen of the hybrid is produced by an artificial stimulus, to which nature indeed succumbs, but to which she exhibits no tendency; and, though the number of mules in a country should equal for a moment that of horses and asses together; yet this will only show that within certain limits the law of nature is plastic, and the known result will surely soon be that horse, mule, and ass will become alike extinct. We do not see that the principle of preferential selection explains this; if these creatures are all the products of one stock by the preferential selection of nature, why do they thus tend to disappear when reduced to these proportions by the preferential selection of man?

Of course to attempt to discuss adequately the results of a tenth part of the papers read before the association would be utterly inconsistent with the demands of these pages, both as regards the quantity and the quality of the matter to be discussed. We touch it only where it touches the higher truth of moral philosophy and theology. We only seek to sound a trumpet to all who are willing to man the walls, which the insidious plausibilities of modern science are threatening; for the surest ground of all defence of all truth, whatever its place in the scale of faith, is to recal men's minds to the great ultimate verities of their moral being and responsibility, of God the author of our Faith, the creator and pillar of all things.

---

ART. II.—*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Rev. Richard Hurd, D.D. Lord Bishop of Worcester.* By the Rev. FRANCIS KILVERT, M.A. London: Bentley.

BISHOP HURD is one of the names of the last century. To most, we suspect, he is little more than a name; connected in the first place with that of Warburton, perhaps without any very distinct idea of the nature of the association; next with criticism: we know, somehow, that Hurd was a critic, meeting here and there with mention of him in Boswell, half respectful, half cynical. We know, too, that he wrote sermons, which, however, we have never read, except, it may be, in disconnected extracts. We are not speaking now of the well-read, the students in the *belles lettres* of theology, who know everything about the eighteenth century as a matter of course. We are guessing at the knowledge of such as do their reading in a desultory fashion, who do not seek out books or pursue a course of reading, but follow a lead; who, while animalcules are the rage, know a vast deal about rotifers; who, when Huë made travels entertaining, were up in Thibet and China; who, so long as Sir Emerson Tennent circulates through Mudie's, are versed in the habits of leeches and elephants; who take to history while they can be edified by Mr. Froude's experiments in the art of washing an Ethiop white. We all of us know a good deal about current literature, whether we read it or not; a certain atmosphere floats round the volumes on our library or drawing-room table which we inhale into our system by an almost involuntary process. How many never breathe any other air! To be out of this atmosphere is, in truth, to be forgotten by the bulk of mankind.

It is the pious aim of Mr. Kilvert, in the present work, to rescue the memory of his 'distinguished relative' from this acknowledged neglect and unmerited oblivion. There seem to him to be many pleas for reviving the world's acquaintance with one who, if not an influential power, possessed weight and authority in his day. We question if the task is a possible one. Fragments of good sense and practical observation can hardly take strong hold on a generation when the personal influence of the writer is over, because opinions in this class of speculation depend mainly for their force on our acquaintance with the personal character of the man who propounds them, and there is not matter enough after eighty or a hundred years to place this vividly or permanently before us. The poet may say, 'E'en in our ashes' life live their wonted fire;' for, to change the metaphor,



he stamps his image on his thoughts, but not the critic or the man of the world, especially where, as here, the details of his life are necessarily meagre. A career like Hurd's of steady ascent from his father's farm to school and college; on to a fellowship, living, and archdeaconry; thence to a bishopric and further translation; where there is little collateral history, and where the progress has been recorded by the fortunate man, not to a domestic circle, but to doctors of divinity, themselves on the way to preferment, with whom unrelaxing dignity of deportment is essential; does not afford matter for exciting interest, especially where the romance of his life, the excesses and extravagancies of a genuine friendship, are to be kept in the background, as already too prominent, the blot in the picture, the one flaw in the example, the error by which those who knew him at all are too apt to judge him. Under these conditions, the chances are much against our having a popular or interesting book.

Nevertheless, there is much to interest and to learn from Mr. Kilvert's volume. We cannot say a character is drawn, but we can construct a character from the facts given us, and one well worth the study, as impersonating its own age, representing a certain stage of thought and habit of mind. We hear so much of the dulness and deadness of the last century that it is not amiss to search into the grounds of so general a charge; and if we find that neither are so dense as readers of modern essays are led to suppose, that a vast deal of quiet intelligence, composed good sense, and sincere religious feeling pervaded that general society which has got the character of being empty and frivolous; that besides certain knots of hard-headed thinkers were setting in motion trains of ideas which have developed into our bolder and more prominent line of thought and action, we may learn to temper, if not wholly to reverse, our hasty judgment. The study will further show us that this same despised age reflects some excellent qualities, which we either regard as something old-fashioned which we have outlived, as being past the common natural stages which need homely supports; or which we more likely assume for ourselves as a matter of course, forgetting that no good quality in its sincerity and perfection is ever a matter of course in any man, but always a happy and distinguishing possession. We think, then, that Bishop Hurd reflects the virtues of his own time when we see in him a certain steady, serviceable faith, not always theological in its tone, perhaps founded more on the one idea of the unity of the Godhead than on the higher spiritual lively apprehension of the great doctrines of the atonement; but an actuating and orthodox faith notwithstanding; one realizing the Divine Pre-

sence, quick to discern the guiding hand of Providence, accepting implicitly the revealed Word, and performing all relative duties, as in the sight of a heavenly Father. Perhaps too exclusively engaged on these, not recognising more distant calls to action, content with a limited sphere, and apathetic to the claims of mankind in the extended meaning of the word; but still with a recognition of duty as such—duty that lies at our door—which we often miss now-a-days. We are always struck, in reading of the worthies of that date, with their simple performance of the whole class of obligations included in the Fifth Commandment, which, in its more literal rendering, seems to comprehend especially those duties for which we have not to seek, which are brought to us—parental obedience, respect for constituted authority, honour to our betters, all the observances towards which natural religion and right instincts lead us. The impulse, a noble and religious one, to go out into the world—the recognition of mankind as one brotherhood, however separated by space and race and habits, has extended even in our own day. The missionary and evangelizing spirit, though not sleeping then, has roused itself to more energetic exertion; a spiritual activity has set in: but with it, in analogy to this diffusive benevolence, selfishness has undoubtedly assumed a more pervading and concentrated influence. Personal ambition, in a more individual and resolute sense than of old, rules with a mastery which we do not see in past times: the old nepotism has changed for the spirit so fatal to the domestic affections and the strength of social ties, of rising in the world; of casting our slough; not merely getting rich, getting honoured, getting established, which were points—as in all ages, so in the eighteenth—fully appreciated, but the desire of changing, if possible, fundamentally, the relation to other men, shaking loose impediments, adopting another standing in the world.

We are not saying that people are inherently less affectionate now than then, but the temptations which war against the social affections have gained force, through the wider sphere of fashion; and perhaps also, from the real increase of refinement. Men were not as sensitive, then, to anomalies, to departures from the received type of good breeding. Society will not tolerate what it once did, consequently it is a greater effort for a man to own his homely relations. Rank was such a definite thing in those days, state so imposing to the imagination, that a person invested with their prestige could indulge his natural sentiments at little cost to his worldly importance. Whether this mere publican's virtue is a merit in the individual or not, it is certainly a merit to the age where its practice is easy. Bishop Hurd would be set down amongst us as a man

of the world; there is no doubt he possessed the art of using his advantages. Born in a homely farm-house, dying in an episcopal palace, his career was one of extraordinary success, but the tender manliness of his conduct throughout, not only to the excellent parents whom it would have been a disgrace to have slighted, and impossible for him not to honour, but to relatives more remotely allied to him, is a pattern and an example. Mr. Kilvert tells us—

‘An amusing anecdote is current in the family respecting the Bishop’s younger brother, Thomas. He was, as the Bishop states, in the Birmingham trade. At that place he had formed an attachment, unknown to his family, to a highly respectable young person, but in humble life, and of no great personal attractions. This attachment resulted in a private marriage. In one of his visits to his parents, his mother, observing him to be unusually silent and thoughtful, pressed him with an affectionate “What ails thee, child?” to tell the cause. The reply, in a faint voice, was, “Mother, I’m married.” “Married!” cried the old lady, “and where’s thy wife?” (Reply in a still fainter key) “I left her in the cart-house.” “Go,” rejoined his mother, “and fetch her in directly.” The poor little woman, shivering with cold and anxiety, was accordingly ushered in from her inhospitable shelter. The feelings of the good old people were touched, and she was welcomed as a member of the family. This plain little person used in after-times, on her visits at Hartlebury Castle, to be led up by the Bishop with stately courtesy to the head of his table, and proved the only medium through which the family was continued.”—*Life and Correspondence of Bishop Hurd*, pp. 3, 4.

Warburton’s bitter pen writes often and lovingly of his mother, confessing to his friend how far he comes short of her worth; he takes into his house his sister and her large family upon the ruin of his brother-in-law in trade, and finds joy in the hospitality; quoting Brutus and Cicero to express his sentiments, while adding that a man who pretends to be a Christian should not come behind a Pagan, how great soever, in the performance of moral duties.’ All will remember the poet Gray’s devotion to the mother who for his sake had kept shop in the city, and with what eloquent pathos he lamented her loss.

Another difference between our own age and that of which we now treat lies in the idea of friendship, or rather its treatment and development. We think men in that time showed an aptitude for a certain close alliance and friendship beyond what we see now. People were more devoted to, more wrapped up in each other then, than now when society and public opinion are in every one’s thoughts, and the universal guides. This is not a welcome notion. As every person thinks of himself that he has an excess of heart and feeling; whether showing itself in expansiveness, or in some mysterious depth of sentiment unknown to others, and needing to be kept in constant check by the possessor; so we are apt to assume for our age that it is peculiar in its measure of the affections. A *past* age, as viewed in its literature, is commonly called a *cold* one. We talk of the

cold conceits of one age, the cold propriety or cold impropriety of another, the cold politeness, the cold accuracy, the cold worldliness of a third; and so forth. We have the gush of feeling, however, disguised by some veil of caprice or reserve. By some cunning process we arrogate for ourselves and our times an exclusive patent of feeling. We take for granted that our affections are developed in some uncommon and exceptional way. The reason of this assumption must lie in the hollowness or coldness which we detect in past modes of expression. Just as we follow the lines of the human frame beneath the costume of our own day, but find past fashions mere disguises, so with those forms of expression which reflect the tone of an age, and which we none of us break through except on rare occasions; we take them for what they profess in our own case, but regard what answered the same purpose a hundred or two years ago as only counterfeits. Thus we do not associate ideas of warm romantic friendship with a careful choice of phrases, and studied clearness and elegance of wording—with correspondents who say 'Sir' to one another at the beginning of a letter, and who expend some considerable part of the conclusion in elaborate expressions of respect. Such forms are incompatible with our ideas of familiarity, and we assume familiarity to be a great part of friendship. Now it may be that we understand familiarity a good deal better than friendship, for ease is a feature of our own day, and we all affect ease towards one another, which to the ear passes muster for intimacy; and so with little reason we settle it, that the close alliances of the last century were associations of convenience or policy or vanity, with very little soul or true earnest about them.

Now we think friendship comes out very well in that age if defined as a love of each other's society, a satisfaction and pride in each other's gifts, a care for each other's interests, a defence of each other's cause, a thought for each other in absence, a sympathy in each other's trials, and toleration of each other's infirmities or social drawbacks; and moreover the intimacy is more genuine than commonly with us in spite of our freedom of style. We believe that more of domestic detail, more of simple family allusion, comes out in the correspondence of men in that time than in our own, supposing as in the cases before us the writers to be bishops or college dons.

Again, we think we cannot be mistaken in asserting that learning took a higher position in the world's respect then. It might be because learning was a monopoly in the hands of a few; but certainly a learned man had a rank, as such, then, which he has not now. There are evidences of more

genuine love of learning in the scholar, more simple contentment in the acquirement of knowledge without any immediate notion of putting it to use; and more reverence for learning in all ranks. There was in that age an immense veneration for scholarship and intellect. Learning secured for its possessors the highest social distinctions; it gave them a warm welcome to the tables of the great, led them to the presence and the favours of royalty itself, and procured them the more substantial rewards of merit. Men were made bishops for the sake of their erudition; as a reward for a life of study. Every neighbourhood was proud of its scholar, put up patiently with his eccentricities, forgave his incivilities, consulted his fancies, accepted his notice as a favour, collected and transmitted his sayings, and took note of his habits, his person, his manners. Men valued him for his own sake, wondering that 'one small head could carry all he knew;' they cared not that he had sprung from artisan or peasant, it was for what he *knew*, not for what he *was*, that they valued him.

What young man of fortune and fashion of our day courts the mere scholar, the rector of a small living, of no social importance beside—as Mr. Cradock must have courted Hurd before he could receive and treasure up the following amusing programme from his self-invited guest:—

'In summer he would sometimes honour me by bringing a friend with him to pass a day at Gumley, when I merely came down to my old house to look after my workmen. Of course it was my wish to make everything as pleasant as possible, and indeed he was inclined to be pleased with everything, for I followed his own directions as nearly as was practicable. "My young friend, we shall not reach you till after breakfast, and then you will give us, as usual, only a nice leg of your mutton and some turnips, a roast fowl, and a plain pudding, or something only of that kind, as I do not eat anything but what is plain. I know you will expect me to drink the University of Cambridge in a bumper of your old hock. After tea we must have another walk, and return in the cool of the evening to Thurstaston. My young friend tells me he has adopted my tea rules from me. I like none so well as Twining's Hyson at seventeen shillings a pound! by choice I never take any other, and indeed I never find it affect my nerves. It is always a treat to me to walk over your romantic territory; and I shall minutely examine all the books that you have lately purchased. I do not wish to meet the Rev. Dr. Parry: he is a good Hebraist, but he is devoted to some dignitaries who are the avowed antagonists of Bishop Warburton. There is a lady from Harborough, Mrs. Allen, who, I find, frequently visits at your house; I should be happy to be introduced to her. She is daughter of the late Professor Anderson."—*Ibid*, pp. 69, 70.

Learning being then so marked a distinction, may account in part for the difference so much in our favour of the deportment towards each other of men of letters. At that time a man's opinions, criticisms, judgments, were his property, his freehold. Whoever infringed these, disparaged or opposed

them, attacked his wealth, what constituted his claim to the goodwill and respect of mankind. The deepest social injury was inflicted, and every passion roused when an hypothesis was attacked, a theory successfully combated, or a new rendering blown upon; and hence the virulence with which the merest abstract and morally indifferent discussions were pursued; the rancour, the lifelong enmities, that grew out of a new view of Virgil's meaning in a particular passage, the asperities which seasoned all controversy, whatever the subject. Whatever the question, however it might set out in smooth, oily, lady-like terms, as 'the Antiquary' has it, it was certain to wax sour and eager in old Scaliger's style, as it went on, and to end 'in a trimmer. 'All the world knows,' writes Cumberland, sore from an attack on his grandfather, the arch-critic Bentley, 'all the world knows that Warburton and Lowth had mouthed and mumbled each other till their very hands blushed, and their lawn sleeves were bloody. I should have thought that the prelate who had Warburton for his antagonist would have hardly found leisure from his own self-defence to have turned aside and fixed his teeth in a bystander.' Happily our scholars, whether bishops or laymen, have lost their likeness to bulldogs, but we maintain that they no longer lie under the old temptation to be scurrilous. Men are ashamed to be mere book-worms in these days; they take their stand on more courtly and carpet considerations. Learning is not now an idol; the world values men for their success in society, and takes little part or interest in the quarrels of the learned, therefore the learned quarrel no more. Some touch of the old manner may indeed be seen in Mr. Ruskin lavishing the epithets of 'base,' and 'doubly base,' and 'brutal,' on those who do not follow him in his notions, but this rather proves our view, for art is more fashionable now than literature, and Mr. Ruskin may hope for sympathisers. But it is time to turn to the individual who has given rise to these general reflections, and whose career is further to illustrate them.

Richard Hurd, the second of three sons, was born at Congreve, in the parish of Penkridge, in the county of Stafford, in January, 1719—20, where his parents, 'plain, honest, and good people,' rented a considerable farm. Early in his friendship with Warburton he thus speaks of them:—

'I believe I never told you how happy I am in an excellent father and mother,—very plain people, you may be sure, for they are farmers, but of a turn of mind that might have honoured any rank and any education. With very tolerable, but in no degree affluent, circumstances, their generosity was such, they never regarded any expense that was in their power, and almost out of it, in whatever regarded the welfare of their children. We are three brothers of us. The eldest [John] settled very reputably in their own way, and the youngest [Thomas] in the Birmingham trade. For myself, a *poor scholar*, as



you know, I am almost ashamed to own how solicitous they always were to furnish me with all the opportunities of the best and most liberal education. My case in so many particulars resembles that which the Roman Poet describes as his own, that with Pope's wit I could apply almost every circumstance of it. And, if ever I were to wish in earnest to be a poet, it would be for the sake of doing justice to so uncommon a virtue. I should be a wretch if I did not conclude, as he does,

*Si natura juberet, &c. &c.*

'In a word, when they had fixed us in such a rank of life, as they designed and believed should satisfy us, they very wisely left the business of the world to such as wanted it more, or liked it better. They considered what age and declining health seemed to demand of them, reserving to themselves only such a support as their few and little wants made them think sufficient. I should beg pardon for troubling you with this humble history; but the subjects of it are so much, and so tenderly, in my thoughts at present, that, if I writ at all, I could hardly help writing about them.—*Ibid.* p. 2.

#### To which Warburton replies:—

'You could not have obliged me more than by bringing me acquainted, as you do in your last kind letter, with persons who can never be indifferent to me, when so near to you. Sir E. Littleton had told me great things of them; and from him I learned that virtue and good sense are hereditary amongst you, and family qualities. And as to filial piety, I knew it could not but crown all the rest of your admirable endowments. Pray make me acquainted with your good father and mother; tell them how sincerely I congratulate with them on the honour of such a son, and how much I share in their happiness on that head.

'Sir Edward oft sees your elder brother, and speaks of him as the best companion he has,—indeed in a very extraordinary manner, of his abilities. Your other brother was, I was told, not long since, among the trading towns in this neighbourhood, where he fell into company at dinner with some of our Somersetshire clergy, by whom he was much caressed on hearing to whom he was related.

'Prior Park, July 14, 1754.'—*Ibid.* p. 3.

He must early have shown the bent of his genius, retaining that affection for his schoolmasters which speaks so well for scholar as well as master. He is reported to have been always assiduous at his books from earliest childhood, and was admitted sizar at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in his fourteenth year, though he did not reside till a year or two later. He took his degree in 1738-9, and was then regarded as a rising scholar. In 1740 we find him in correspondence with persons of some consideration; his letters being then marked by that stiffness and formality of expression which indicates working a way to a style, and which must always be tolerated in the young as more promising than mere ease and nothing else. Criticism was even then his turn, and he writes on the graver books of the day, forgotten now, with a remarkable gravity of interest. Such passages as the following give evidence to the

general tone of disparagement of Scripture which we so often find acknowledged in the writings of that time.

'Think not, Sir, I mention this as though I thought the poetry of David could receive any additional glory or merit from any resemblance it may be found to bear to the flights of Pagan writers. That I know is impossible; but must own it gives me some pleasure to meet with passages in heathen learning that are parallel to those in sacred writ, since it is by such kind of proof only that many classical pretenders to criticism will suffer themselves to be convinced of the beauty of those sublimest of compositions.'—*Ibid.* p. 10.

In June, 1742, he was ordained Deacon, and had a temporary charge of a small parish in Norfolk, where he has to lament the wonderful scarcity of reputable clergymen. 'Sober are rare, but learned I have not heard of one near me.' Here, on that principle of duty which always actuated Hurd as far as he recognised it, he set about writing sermons. 'Sermonizing' was his apology for not writing letters. 'As I have tired myself a good deal to-day with writing a sermon, you'll excuse my talking by bits and scraps, &c.' At the same time his prospects were very much in his thoughts: whether he should stand for a fellowship, or, as he at first preferred, 'cut out his name' from its books, and 'instead of reposing in the shade of a college, trust his fortune to the world.' This world was already beginning to smile on him. He reports having been treated with great civility by this and that person of distinction. There must undoubtedly have been a singular charm about him when he wished to please, however formal and reserved in company not to his taste. Warburton calls him 'the idol of his friends,' and when later in life he was presented, George the Third 'was pleased to remark that he thought him more naturally polite than any man he had ever met with.' That he had tact, and knew what manner could and could not do, is evident from his mention of his first parishioners. The tithes of Reymerston were rated too low, which he was perfectly aware of, but the really 'rising man' is not of the sort to get into a lawsuit about tithes.

'In respect of the tithes of Reymerston, which you are pleased to mention, I apprehend, not only that they cannot *now*, but that they cannot *ever*, by me be materially altered. The temper of the people is so resolutely obstinate, that upon any such attempt I am certain they would leave the church; of which, though in the assertion of my just rights, I should think myself unhappy in being the occasion. The rent-day is over; and the income is (though not, indeed, this year on account of some deductions) a good eighty pounds. I am sensible, as you suggest to me, that it is worth much more; but am assured it will never be in the power of that address you are so polite to compliment me upon, to advance it. And as to gathering, it is what I must never think of: for the inclosures are so small, so perplexed, and lie in such a manner, that the trouble of doing it would be infinite. Though in this case I am prudent enough to keep my thoughts to myself. They would otherwise be apt to take advantages.'—*Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

Here in his first parish we find some prim allusions to the ladies, whom he thinks it worth while to describe as agreeable and polite; but there is no indication of his ever having formed an attachment, or even ever feeling the need of female society; there was, in fact, an element of the feminine in his own nature, which no doubt accounts for the extraordinary hold Warburton's vast, colossal, and rude qualities had on him, and the consistent friendship that subsisted between them, and also for the epithet his enemies chose for him, 'an old maid in breeches.' His own old-maidism clearly made him unsympathising towards feminine weakness in the other sex. 'If ever I fall in love,' he says, 'it shall not be with a poetess,' alluding to Pope's friendship with Martha Blount. And again, half in jest, 'When I contemplate this faculty the ladies have got of being well everywhere but at home \* \* \* I shudder at the thought of matrimony, and half acquit this libertine age for the disgust it has conceived of it.' So there was no Mrs. Hurd to disturb the exquisite order, quiet, and decorum which surrounded our friend throughout his existence.

His was one of those constitutions of mind and body which attain their object in life. He instinctively took the right way to gain his ends. He was a man of the world in its best sense, as he has himself well described it.

'It is this art of entering into the characters, prejudices, and expectations of others, and of knowing how to suit our application prudently, but with innocence, to them, which constitutes what we call A KNOWLEDGE OF THE WORLD. An art of which the great poet (Horace) was a consummate master, and than which there cannot be a more useful or amiable quality. Only we must take care not to confound it with that supple, versatile, and intriguing genius, which, taking all shapes and reflecting all characters, generally passes for it in the commerce of the world, or rather is prized much above it; but, as requiring no other talents in the possessor than those of a *low cunning* and *corrupt design*, is of all others the most mischievous, worthless, and contemptible character, that infests human life.'—*Ibid.* p. 346.

The passage proves that he had studied this branch of knowledge; indeed, the question was one well suited to his turn of thought. He was naturally a student of character, not so much through the intercourse of general society, for which his fastidious nature disqualified him, as in books. He loved to investigate motives, to look into the springs of great actions and leading careers; and where the character was congenial, this is done with much felicity of thought and expression, both in his characters and his dialogues. But the knowledge of character, the tracing of action to its source is a power which people can only possess in proportion to their other powers: a person possessed of it will understand all it can grasp and fathom in others, but there may be a whole range of qualities in the character studied, which will

never enter in the field of their perception; they have not intellectual sight for it. Thus with Hurd the character delineated must have some affinity with his own, or he is at fault; it must be marked by sense rather than genius, and it must not be tintured by enthusiasm. Enthusiasm with him and Warburton is synonymous with fanaticism, and of both these qualities they can only take a merely external and unsympathising view. Thus Hurd can draw Archbishop Williams, but entirely fails in Savonarola. His motto through life was 'think soberly;' there is something remarkable in the consistent courage with which he set down and disparaged flights of every sort. It is the deliberate conviction of a sensible man that for practical purposes, heights and depths are inconvenient; that we do better, that the world thrives better, in a just medium. There is, we repeat, courage in recording the following preference for exquisite good sense over the highest flights of imagination. There are evidences of his being able to appreciate Shakespeare to the full as highly as men generally do, but his relish for truth in a less elevated range was of a more vivid character. Writing to the poet Mason in 1770, he says:—

'I have found an amusement lately in turning over the works of Mr. Addison. I set out many years ago with a warm admiration of this amiable writer. I then took a surfeit of his natural easy manner, and was taken (like my betters) with the rapturous and high flights of Shakespeare. My maturer judgment, or lenient age (call it which you will) has now led me back to the favourite of my youth. And here I think I shall stick: for such useful sense in so charming words I find not elsewhere. His taste is so pure, and his Virgilian prose (as Dr. Young calls it) so exquisite, that I have but now found out, at the close of a critical life, the full value of his writings.'—*Ibid.* pp. 363-4.

The words 'deep,' 'depth,' 'originality,' and the like, are never applied by him, or suffered to pass, without conveying some trait of this mistrust; even where he applies the term in a favourable sense to Shakespeare, it is what is called 'originality that is freshness and novelty.' Addison cannot speak of *depth* of style, but in a note we find this word explained—'*deep*, that is, excellent;' and he despises Locke for aiming at the reputation of an original thinker. 'The affectation of passing for an original thinker glares strongly and ridiculously in Mr. Locke;' and we find Mr. Kilvert confirming our view. 'Another idol of 'the present day,' he writes, 'is *originality*. In opposition to this, 'the Bishop's opinion was that originality is an inferior merit to 'the dexterous use and application of thoughts already struck out.'

Now Hurd was undoubtedly a clear-headed, clear-sighted man, with a mind well practised to pursue and investigate. It might be the union of self-respect with a just and not too partial appreciation of his own powers which produced this preference for mediocrity—to use the word in its literal sense,

not as meaning inferiority. It is not difficult to understand how such a man should deliberately estimate the worth of things by his power of understanding them. Most people do the same without owning it or rather without knowing it; but he was exactly aware of the nature of his own faculties and of his likes and dislikes, and was ashamed of nothing about himself. A grave and impartial self-respect was the basis of his character and fortunes. Of course a person who found his mind and habits of thought in such exact accord with the external world, was not likely to have much pity or sympathy with unsatisfied aspirations. It is often an illustration of Andersen's fable of the 'ugly duck' and the 'hen' who represents common sense, and used to say, 'We and the world.' But, says the incipient swan, 'it is so delightful to swim in the water, so delightful when it dashes over one's head and one dives down to the very bottom.' 'What next?' said the hen, whose experiences all lay in another direction.

Hurd's early manhood is distinguished by a gravity and propriety of pursuits which marked him out at once as a person of weight. At four-and-twenty we find him entering upon controversy, and contending against 'unorthodox,' 'chimerical,' 'whimsical and enthusiastic performances' and 'pieces,' &c. and about that age he began his common-place book, a record and commentary of books read, and a register of passing thoughts and reflections which he continued through life, and which is still preserved in the library of Hartlebury Castle. It was at this time that 'Warburton's Divine Legation' came upon the world and excited universal attention and not a little suspicion. Hurd writes from Cambridge of the first attack, and the 'acrimony' and 'resentment' which arose from it.

In 1745 he writes:—

'The attention of the learned world at present turns entirely almost on the author of the Divine Legation of Moses, who is mowing down his adversaries with as great zeal and success as ever old Bentley did before him. Indeed the superior genius and abilities of that writer gave him a very great advantage over all the gentlemen that have appeared against him, whatever may be determined finally of his cause. A piece he has just now published in answer to Dr. Stebbing and Sykes is very ingenious, but wrote with a severe satiric spirit peculiar to himself and his late friend Mr. Pope.'—*Ibid.* p. 23.

In 1749, Hurd confirmed his own reputation as a writer by his commentary, and 'Notes on Horace's Art of Poetry,' of which Gibbon has written:—

'Mr. Hurd, the supposed author of this performance, is one of those valuable authors who cannot be read without improvement. To a great fund of well-digested learning, he adds a clearness of judgment and a niceness of penetration capable of tracing things from their first principles, and observing their most minute differences. I know few writers more deserving of the great but prostituted name of critic.'—*Ibid.* p. 30.

In the notes to this work Hurd had inserted a graceful compliment to Warburton as the friend and commentator of Pope, which was replied to by an equally well-turned compliment from Warburton, also in a note to the 'Essay on Criticism.' These civilities proved more sterling coin than such effusions often do; they emanated from a genuine sympathy; a union of pursuits and dissimilarity of character alike marked them out as suited to one another, and they no sooner met than they were fast friends. The genius of Hurd at once recognised its master, and seemed from the first to have gloried in being the subject of such an ascendancy. We do not wonder; the portraits of that jovial Colossus of learning have a remarkable fascination. There is a wild irresponsible sense of power about him which reminds one of a lion, a giant, an Irishman at a fair. His relish for fighting, his extraordinary skill at vituperation, his contempt and scorn of opposition, his profound belief in himself, his intense realization of the truth and importance of his own theories, his thorough-going partizanship, his genial temper, and we must add his genuine, honest, religious faith, all point him out the idol of his friends as certainly as he must have been the detestation of his foes. The effect upon Hurd was magical; cautious and unenthusiastic by nature, his zeal for Warburton made him reckless and infatuated. He learnt to rail from his master, nor did time or death ever make him regret the excesses into which the extravagance of his friendship led him. Warburton had been trained in a good school for contempt and abuse. He succeeded to Bentley's critical style, and he was the chosen friend and theological defender of Pope, had been thick in the splenetic politics of the *Dunciad*, and had learnt to call names in the best company. But he had never forgotten the paramount claims of theology. Our readers need not be told the great argument of the 'Divine Legation,' which goes to prove the inspiration of Moses and the divine origin of his law from the omission of the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. False religions, setting forth false gods, all taught a future state as a necessary mode of accounting for present imperfections in the world's scheme. Moses could promise an exact scale of temporal rewards and punishments; and a particular especial Providence in the one instance of the chosen people worked out his promises. A prodigious amount of learning was brought to bear upon this argument with a vigour and liveliness of style which commanded attention. But the argument was new, and the religious world viewed it with extreme suspicion, though there were notable exceptions, as Bishops Sherlock and Hare and the Nonconformist Doddridge. Warburton found his orthodoxy attacked and his faith called



in question: 'it stuck with candid men how a religion without a future state could be worthy of God.' Conscious of his own honesty of purpose he could never give credit to his opponents even for good intentions, he regarded them as filchers of his good name and railed on them as so many pickpockets. He thereupon 'assumed,' as a writer of the time has it, 'the high office of Inquisitor-General and supreme judge of the opinions of the learned, and exercised it with a ferocity and a despotism without example in the republic of letters.' He declared himself in periodicals, notes, letters, by word of mouth, and his friend Hurd thought all worth preserving and reproduction. Let us take a few flowers from this branch of rhetoric. It can scarcely be deemed a digression, for Hurd cannot be treated wholly apart from his friend. A certain Mr. Webster attacked him:—

'To think I will ever enter into a controversy with the weakest as well as wickedest of all mankind, is a thing impossible. This I shall do, indeed, in a short Preface to the *Second Volume*. I shall hang him and his fellows as they do vermin in a warren, and leave them to posterity to stink and blacken in the wind; and this will I do was the Pope himself their protector. Other business with them in the way of argument I shall never have any.'—*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v. p. 548.

The Rev. W. Romaine from Epsom writes in a curious strain, but with well-chosen arguments against the view. Warburton writes:—

'I hope you received one from me by the last post, and that we shall ferret out the *Epsom Letter-writer*.

It is the sport, to see the Ingeneer  
Hoist with his own petar—

says Shakespeare. If it was he, never was there a more execrable scoundrel, who calls down the secular arm upon me. Can I outlive it? If I do, it will be in mere spight, to rub another volume of the Divine Legation in the noses of bigots and zealots.'—*Ibid.* p. 554.

We meet everywhere the phrases 'dunces,' 'wretches,' 'insipid creatures,' 'abandoned libeller,' 'scoundrel temper,' 'senseless, abandoned scribbler,' 'profligate scribblers,' 'worthless crew,' 'infamous rhapsody,' and the like. Any person who expressed an opinion contrary to anything he had published, especially in his 'Magnum Opus,' whether he did it designedly or not, was gibbeted without mercy; his prefaces and notes, as was observed at the time, being the established places of execution for the punishment of all who did not implicitly adopt his sentiments. We sometimes are disposed to think that vice itself cannot incur worse language than a mistake or difference of opinion, but he had degrees—further depths—as where, in his place in the House of Lords, he apologised to Satan for having supposed him capable of inditing Wilkes's pamphlet.

Like Johnson, he makes free use of the charge of lying. With him there was no distinction between mistake of judgment and wilful misrepresentation, that in the one case a man *lies*, in the other he lies and *knows* that he *lies*; with the further variation of being maliciously mistaken. Sometimes we do not so much quarrel with his terms, as where he pronounces Lawrence Sterne an 'irrecoverable scoundrel;' or where, in Hume's case, he threatens 'to trim the rogue's jacket;' or even where he gives judicial sentence on a libellous scribbler, who writes bad verses and attaches Milton's name to them.

'On which I will venture to pronounce condemnation in due form of law—that it shall *return from whence it came*. From a dunghill he says he received it, and to a dunghill it shall go, let him print upon as stiff paper as he pleases. In this case I am as clear and positive as the famous Etymologist, who said he not only knew from whence words came, but whither they were going.'—*Ibid.* vol. v. p. 645.

Or where he satirises the public.

'Lauder has offered much amusement for the public, and they are obliged to him. What the public wants, or subsists on, is news. Milton was their reigning favourite; yet they took it well of a man they had never heard of before, to tell them the news of Milton being a thief and a plagiarist; had he been proved a — it had pleased them much better. When this was no longer news, they were equally delighted with another, as much a stranger to them, who entertained them with another piece of news, that Lauder was a plagiarist and an impostor; had he proved him a Jesuit in disguise, nothing had equalled their satisfaction.'—*Ibid.* vol. v. p. 650.

It is amusing to see names of note occurring in these letters as 'one Horne,' and '*this* Johnson'—'Of this Johnson you and I, I believe, think alike.' And let us note that Johnson never stands out more amiably than in contrast to this reckless and promiscuous vituperation: while Warburton speaks of his '*insolence*,' and '*malignant reflections on his notes to Shakespeare*.' Johnson always did justice to Warburton, was grateful to him for 'praise when praise was of value to him,' and adduced him, in his celebrated interview with George the Third, as 'greatly more learned than himself.' He—

'Johnson had not been able to read much compared with others; for instance, he had not been able to read much compared with Dr. Warburton. Upon which the King said, that he heard Dr. Warburton was a man of such general knowledge, that you could scarce talk with him on any subject on which he was not qualified to speak, and that his learning resembled Garrick's acting in its universality.'—*Boswell's Johnson*.

Elsewhere, Boswell says:—

'I am informed that Warburton said of Johnson, "I admire him, but I cannot bear his style;" and that Johnson being told of this, said, "That is exactly my case against him." The manner in which he expressed his admiration of the fertility of Warburton's genius, and of the variety of his materials, was—"The table is always full, sir. He brings things from the north and the south, and from every quarter. In his Divine Legation you are always entertained. He

carries you round and round, and without carrying you forward to the point, but then you have no wish to be carried forward." He said to the Rev. Mr. Strahan, "Warburton is perhaps the last man who has written with a mind full of reading and reflection."—*Ibid.*

In spite of these testimonies of respect, it is plain there was little real congeniality between these rival giants, neither of whom could have taken a subordinate part. They met but once, and though the interview was satisfactory, it was never repeated. Warburton's excesses of language, however much they enabled him to carry it over tamer spirits, really weakened his influence, and permanently lowered his reputation. Johnson's tone, whenever we encounter the name of Warburton, shows that superiority that reason must have over unrestraint, and assumes the empire; as where he speaks of the controversy that raged on Pope's 'Essay on Man,' commented on by the Swiss, Mr. Crousaz, and defended with rancour by Warburton. He recommends the learned world to elect a moderator for all disputes.

'Among the duties of a moderator, I have mentioned that of recalling the disputants to the subject, and cutting off the excrescences of a debate, which Mr. Crousaz will not suffer to be long unemployed; and the repression of personal invectives, which have not been very carefully avoided on either part, and are less excusable because it has not been proved that either the poet or his commentator wrote with any other design than that of promoting happiness, by cultivating reason and piety.'—*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v. p. 579.

Something must be allowed for the literary habits of the time, always profuse in its tone towards persons, whether for praise or blame; the strain of compliment and detraction alike extravagant. Doddridge's letters to Warburton are adulatory; and Warburton always writes as though his friends and opponents represented the wheat and the tares, and the good or bad fishes; while it was evidently necessary for Warburton's friends who would retain his friendship, to treat all who attacked him as infamous. A way of assuming to be better than other people belongs to the correspondence of all these worthies. Pope and Warburton, Warburton and his friends generally, Hurd and Sir E. Littleton, all adopt this tone. It was the thing to write to one another of the goodness of their hearts, their disinterestedness, their superiority to vulgar objects of desire; to treat, for instance, honours and preferment as of value mainly as proving the worth of the donor. Those who confer them are noble-minded, those who withhold them slaves and creatures. Wherever flattery is an established element there must be vituperation to balance it; yet, while we use the term flattery, we do not mean any intentional insincerity. People did not affect candour then; they took sides, and stood thick and thin by their party, whether social, religious, or political. We are not to suppose that

Warburton was left undisturbed master of the field; many tried their strength with him. He pronounced a state of authorship a state of war, and called the hand that wielded the pen, his sword-hand. People questioned the accuracy of his learning, the clearness of his reasoning, and wrote sorely of his 'muddy head and bitter heart.' There were some who even dared to encounter him face to face, as when he taxed Doctor Taylor, the philologist, with having been reported to say that he was no scholar, and the Doctor plucked up spirit to reply 'that he did not recollect ever saying that Dr. Warburton was no scholar, but that indeed he had always thought so.'

There are no evidences of Warburton bearing malice; he was thick-skinned, thought all this good sport himself, and did not see why others should suffer more. He boasts somewhere of being callous. 'I believe,' he writes, 'as few men die of the rage or envy of dunces as of the frowns of their mistresses; and there is as little mischief done by literary as by amatory squabbles.' He lacked the quality of respect altogether. Wherever he was, whatever subject he touched, he must give room to his humour, and could bear no restraint. Antiquity, though his mind was so much engaged upon the past, had no charm to check the licence of his tongue. The Society of Antiquaries was 'a hospital for blockheads.' Nor did patristical learning teach him better manners. John of Antioch he suspects of being a 'Shag-rag.'

'As for that forlorn hope Theodoret, Philostorgius, Nicephoras, and Theophanes, I shall put them where they can do no hurt: as to good, little is to be expected from such poltroons, who are ready to run away to the enemy.'—*Ibid.* vol. v. p. 649.

Never was so much faith joined to so little reverence. For faith he had. His whole tone toward Scripture is one of undoubting, implicit belief. He threw himself with ardour into the controversy on miracles, occasioned by Middleton's sceptical tone, and wrote a treatise to prove the miracle which defeated Julian's attempt to rebuild Jerusalem. But in his own nature there was an absence of awe, or fear of anything human or divine. Perhaps all controversy tends to this, to deprive all mysteries of their terrors, to make the sacred familiar. A writer in the 'Quarterly' attributes to him the disuse of splendid vestments, which some in our own day have made themselves confessors to restore. But it was on personal, not on ecclesiastical grounds, that he got rid of copes: they ruffled his wig and consequently his temper, both of which articles were easily disarranged.

'A friend of ours, many years ago, on being shown, among the curiosities of Durham Cathedral, the splendid vestments formerly worn by the prebendaries,

asked how they had come to be disused; when the verger said, "It happened in my time. Did you ever hear of one Dr. Warburton, sir?—a very hot man he was, sir. We never could please him in putting on his robe. This stiff high collar used to ruffle his great full-bottomed wig; till one day he threw the robe off in a great passion, and said he never would wear it again, and he never did, and the other gentlemen soon left theirs off too."—*Quarterly*, vol. xxxii. p. 273 (1825).

He always showed an extreme carelessness as to the impression his conduct made upon others, and never did things because they were expected of him. Even his worshipper Hurd admitted to being 'agonized' at his indifference to the proprieties in public. Cradock writes:—

I was introduced into the vestry-room by a friend, where the lord mayor and several of the governors of the hospital were waiting for the late Duke of York, who was then president, and in the meantime the Bishop (Warburton) did everything in his power to entertain and alleviate their impatience. He was beyond measure condescending and courteous, and even graciously handed some biscuits and wine on a salver to the curate who was to read prayers. His lordship being in good spirits, once exceeded the bounds of decorum by quoting a comic passage from Shakespeare in his lawn sleeves, and with all its characteristic humour; but suddenly recollecting himself, he so aptly turned the inadvertence to his own advantage, as to raise the admiration of all the company. Many parts of his discourse were quite sublime, and were given with due solemnity; but a few passages were, as in his celebrated triennial Charge, quite ludicrous, as when he proceeded so far as to describe some charitable monks who had robbed their own begging boxes, he excited more than a smile from most of his audience. "Though certainly, sir, said I (to Hurd), there was much to admire, yet upon the whole, to speak the truth, I was not sorry that you were absent, for I well knew that you would not have absolutely approved."—*Cradock's Literary Miscellanies*, vol. i. p. 187.

His mode in handling texts shows the same easy turn—'and by good luck we find in the Hebrews;' 'but the Apostle tells another story,' &c. His Charges, which have the rare commendation of being lively and entertaining, talk of 'a magnificent show of viands, and all from the hog-stye,' and a sermon 'of hocus-pocus tricks.' We are glad to find that, at any rate, he carried his easy manners to court with him when he went there, which was not often. On his first appearance on that scene, the lord-in-waiting called to him, 'Move forward, you clog up the doorway;' to whom he promptly replied, 'Did nobody clog up the king's doorway more than I, there would be more room for honest men.' Traits like these perhaps do not go far in accounting for the wonderful prestige of Warburton's name amongst his contemporaries, and the sort of passion of admiration which many felt for him. But there was a magnificent exuberance about him which fascinated those who were permitted to feel the sunshine of his loveable qualities. He could fill the minds and hearts of his friends. Pope clung to him as a prop and stay. Allen of Prior Park welcomed him to his closest intimacy, and

gave him his favourite niece and heiress. He charmed all whom he cared to please. His manner was frank: he liked society, and was not fastidious. He opened the whole store of his rich nature to his friends. What Mr. Seward said of him was true:—

‘Mr. Seward has well observed, that the Bishop “was one of the best letter-writers that ever put pen to paper. His knowledge was curious and extensive; he had great wit, and great force of expression, and no reserve in communicating what his thoughts were at the time he wrote the letters.”’—*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v. p. 652.

The habit of contempt does not so blight a man’s nature, is not so corroding (because after all it is not genuine), if it is not a solitary exercise, and if it is expressed with jovial recklessness. He was a man who must have friends, must have a home and room for the play of the affections; and in such circumstances the contemptuous humour is kept down. He was a good husband, a most tender and admiring son, a fond father, and though we cannot hold him an example in the performance of his onerous episcopal duties, it was by no means because he neglected them. He was remarkable for a rigid abstemiousness, the more striking from his large frame and genial temperament. His asceticism was in the cause of learning. Study was the absorbing pleasure and chosen business of his life; and conscious that if he ate and drank like other men, he must devote much time to relaxation and exercise, he deliberately chose a strict moderation, that no care of the body might stand in the way of the paramount pursuit. His appetite for books was indiscriminate; very different from his friend Hurd, who ‘read only the best things,’ he read everything and remembered everything, and after long application to deeper studies would run through novels from the circulating library by the basket full, and laugh over them by the hour. He had a deep religious sense, though we must wish, in his dealings with the Methodists, that he could have understood and sympathised more fully with their aspirations, and not been so ready to fly off at a tangent about enthusiasts and bigots. Yet his sincerity won their respect as well as his learning, and John Wesley wrote of him, ‘I let Bishop Warburton alone; he is gone to rest! I well hope, in Abraham’s bosom.’ In a letter to Dr. Birch he writes on the subject of inspired truth:—

‘This morning I had a letter from Cambridge, acquainting me with Dr. Middleton’s death. They suppose his builder has killed him, or at least hastened his death. “He declared,” says my letter, “a few days ago, that he should die with that composure of mind which he thought must be the enjoyment of every man who had been a sincere searcher after truth; expressed some concern that he felt his strength and spirits decline so fast that he could



not complete some designs he had then in hand: and that he imagined he had given the miracles of the early ages such a blow as they would not easily recover."

'I do not see how the mere discovery of truth affords such pleasure. If this truth be, that the providence of God governs the moral as well as natural world; and that, in compassion to human distresses, He has revealed his will to mankind, by which we are enabled to get the better of them, by a restoration to his favour, I can easily conceive the pleasure that, at any period of life, must accompany such a discovery. But if the truth discovered be that we have no farther share in God than as we partake of his natural government of the universe; or that all there is in his moral government is only the natural necessary effects of virtue and vice upon human agents here, and that all the pretended revelations of an hereafter were begot by fools, and hurried up by knaves; if this, I say, be our boasted discovery, it must, I think, prove a very uncomfortable contemplation, especially in our last hours. But every man has his taste. I only speak for myself.'—*Ibid.* pp. 647-8.

And there is a striking passage in a letter to Sherlock, where, in announcing a copy of the second edition of the '*Divine Legation*,' he says:—

'For I will tell your lordship what it is that supports me,—it is the love of truth, and a thorough conviction of the reality of the Jewish and Christian revelations. I think I am not too uncharitable in suspecting that it may be a want of the latter that makes some very zealous people cooler and more suspicious of the former than is fitting. Hence we see them almost frightened to death at every foolish book writ against religion, and betake themselves in all haste to their old posture of defence, to prop and buttress up with any materials that came to hand what they think a sinking fabric, because they do not see the eternal foundations on which it stands.'—*Literary Remains of Bishop Warburton*, p. 66.

But we have been led away too long from our main subject. The name of Warburton, however, is inseparable from that of Hurd, and some explanation is needed of the powerful ascendancy which coloured his whole life. It was an ascendancy, and yet the influence was mutual. Hurd never lost or merged his own character in that of his friend. He was always welcome to Mrs. Warburton, that his *oil* might allay her husband's vinegar. If he spoke of Warburton's eagle-eyed sagacity, the other corroborated the testimony 'that Mr. Hurd was a man who sees by 'an early penetration that which the generality never find out 'till they have drugged on to the end of life.' If Hurd was impelled to undue severity of language, in defending his friend with his own rough weapons, he was an habitual restraint upon Warburton. He could not help weighing every word he spoke or wrote, so that Johnson called him 'a word-picker,' and was so much on his guard in conversation that Cradock gives it as his opinion that Warburton was never thoroughly at his ease in his company, though he felt so warmly towards him. Hurd's habits of thought would all contribute to this; he was essentially systematic. His judgment was always at work to the silencing of his feelings. Johnson said of him:—

'Hurd, sir, is one of a set of men who account for everything systematically; for instance, it has been a fashion to wear scarlet breeches; these men would tell you that, according to causes and effects, no other wear could at that time have been chosen.'

Adding, however, 'Hurd, sir, is a man whose acquaintance is a valuable acquisition.' His friendship left the constitution of his mind untouched; his preferences on ordinary points of criticism remained undisturbed. He deliberately preferred finish to energy, and fearlessly expressed his opinion. 'We,' says Mr. Kilvert, 'are inclined to estimate it (literary merit) rather by the amount of energy exhibited in literary composition than by the perfection of the work produced by it.' He took the contrary view. From him the *facetum* (finished elegancies) of Virgil found more approval than the forcible simplicity of Homer.

But where Warburton's fame or credit was involved, the calmness of his temperament and his critical acumen gave way, and his biographer has to apologise for an outbreak which, to modern readers, seems sufficiently unprovoked.

'In the year 1755 an opportunity was given to Mr. Hurd of signaling his attachment to Mr. Warburton, of which he availed himself too much in the style of his friend and patron. Warburton, in the second book of his "Divine Legation of Moses," had broached the opinion that the descent of Æneas into Hades, in the sixth book of Virgil's *Æneid*, was an allegory representing the ceremony of initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. From this opinion Dr. Jortin had ventured in his Sixth Dissertation to express partial dissent, in respectful terms, indeed, but, as was thought by Hurd, with that degree of faint praise which implies indirect condemnation. This gave occasion to a pamphlet from Hurd, entitled, "The Delicacy of Friendship, a Seventh Dissertation, addressed to the Author of the Sixth." In this piece he exposes in the most unsparing manner what he deemed an insidious attack upon the theory of his friend. It is indeed a masterpiece of keen and delicate irony, but no candid judge can do otherwise than regret that so severe an attack should have been made on a man of Jortin's talent and character on such slight provocation.'—*Life and Correspondence of Bishop Hurd*, pp. 53-4.

And again—

'The year 1758 witnessed another of those over-zealous defences of his friend Warburton which, however they may prove the strength of Mr. Hurd's attachment, reflect the least credit on his courtesy and liberality as a controversialist. This was his "Letter to Dr. Thomas Leland, on his Dissertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence," in which the expression of some dissent from Warburton's sentiments in his "Doctrine of Grace," is treated with a keenness and asperity totally out of place, considering the deservedly high character of Dr. Leland as a writer, and the openness of the question under discussion.'—*Ibid.* pp. 72-3.

Though Hurd never apologised for or recanted his attacks either on Jortin or Leland, he would no doubt have been willing they should be forgotten. But there is a retributive justice at work in these things; and thirty-four years after the publication of the first of these tracts, and twenty-five after the

second, when Hurd, now Bishop of Worcester, had attained his seventieth year, Dr. Parr chose to republish them, along with some early treatises by Warburton, which he had wished to suppress, under the heading 'Tracts by a Warburtonian,' adding his own pungent comments, acting it is supposed, under the irritation of having met with a cold reception, and not being asked to dinner when he presented himself at Hartlebury Castle for institution to the benefice of Hatton. The thing made a great noise, and was much read and relished, which no doubt Hurd knew quite as well as though he had read the attack on himself, which, on the principle of all phlegmatic tempers, he did not. He read, however, a defence of himself which appeared, and writes, 'As to the letter to Dr. Parr, I have read it, which is scarcely fair, as I never read, and never shall read, the *thing* to which the letter is an answer.' Had he a notion all the while that by these long-ago asperities, these flourishes of an intemperate partisanship, he should be remembered more than by the deliberate, careful efforts of his own judgment, engaged on congenial subjects of theology and criticism, through a long studious life? and that he of all people should be known and adduced as an extreme example of the literary acrimony of his own time? It is thus Dr. Parr addresses his diocesan in his dedication:—

'The distinguishing virtues even of the best of men may for a time be eclipsed by particular situations; while, therefore, we allow your lordship all the praise which is due to habitual discretion and constitutional gentleness, we are by no means surprised that in the service of such a leader you were now and then hurried into rashness, sharpened into acrimony, or betrayed into illiberality. We rather lament that the better propensities of your mind were suspended, and indeed overborne, by the fascination of Warburton's example and the sternness of his commands; and, with all due deference, let me add, the tremendous severity of his threats. We mourn over the common infirmities of human nature itself, when we recollect that with a temper which effectually preserved you from the tumultuous fervour of enthusiasm, and with talents which might have procured you success in the regular and ordinary course of controversial hostilities, you were disposed, or I would rather say destined, to become the herald of the sturdiest knight-errant that ever set out in quest of literary crusades—to become the apologist, nay the avenger, of a staunch polemic, who attacked with blind and headstrong fury the most unexplored fastnesses of impiety, and the most venerable citadels of truth—to become the drudge of an imperious task-master, who, finding himself accompanied by a train of feeble and officious dwarfs, summoned them by his fierce mandates to plunge with him into every

‘difficulty, to triumph with him in every victory, to make a display of their fidelity or their zeal in every wild or desperate achievement which he was himself emboldened to undertake by the consciousness of his own gigantic strength. “The staff of his spear was like a weaver’s beam,” and “one bearing a shield always went before him.”—(*Parr’s Works*, vol. vi. p. 371.)

If Dr. Hurd could have read this dispassionately, we think he would have pronounced favourably on the point and force of its style. After it, Parr could afford to be generous, to allow nobody to disparage Hurd but himself—to reprove others, after the manner of satirists, for not doing his victim justice, ‘and of not speaking with sufficient caution of so illustrious a prelate as ‘Dr. Hurd;’ and to defend him in a long argument with the Prince Regent, his quondam pupil, as a better tutor than Dr. Markham, who subsequently filled this office, and with whom the Prince compared him. ‘Have you not changed your opinion of Dr. Hurd?’ exclaimed the Prince, who probably thought his topic not well chosen.

‘I have read a work in which you attacked him fiercely.—Yes, sir, I attacked him on one point, which I thought important to letters, and I summoned the whole force of my mind, and took every possible pains to do it well, for I consider Hurd to be a great man. He is celebrated as such by foreign critics, who appreciate justly his wonderful acuteness, sagacity, and dexterity in doing what he has done with so small a stock of learning. \* \* \* From a farmhouse and village-school Hurd emerged the friend of Gray and a circle of distinguished men. While fellow of a small college, he sent out works praised by foreign critics, and not despised by our own scholars. He enriched his understanding by study, and sent from the obscurity of a country village a book, sir, which your royal father is said to have declared made him a bishop. He made himself unpopular in his own profession by the defence of a fantastical system. He had decriers—he had no trumpeters; he was great in and by himself; and perhaps, sir, a portion of that power and adroitness you have manifested in this debate might have been owing to him.’—*Life and Correspondence of Bishop Hurd*, pp. 373-4.

Many years afterwards Hurd and Parr met; the interview tells well for both:—

‘At one of Hurd’s visitations in the latter part of his life, he observed Dr. Parr among the clergy, and, walking up to him, said, “Dr. Parr, there has long been variance between us, but my age is now so advanced that I can no longer afford to be at enmity with any human being, and therefore earnestly request that we may shake hands, and consign the past to oblivion.” My informant added that Parr was affected even to tears by this address.’—*Ibid.* p. 376.

Mr. Kilvert is somewhat ashamed of this part of his subject, and passes it over as quickly as possible, being anxious to show Bishop Hurd following the bent of his own amiable, cool, philosophic nature, not warped out of symmetry by the prepossessions of his friendship. Still his introduction to Warburton was the turning-point of his life—his mind had been up to that time quietly forming itself, and taking its own independent bias;

as he expresses it, 'I grew up into the use of a little common sense,' but he seems instantly to have felt the value of such an ally. It was part of Warburton's idea of friendship to push the fortunes of his friends. He procured for Hurd a welcome to Prior Park, where he was ever after received on terms of friendly intimacy. He introduced him to other men of note, Mr. Murray and Charles Yorke, who were at once attracted by his conversation and manners—

'To whom his solid learning, his refined taste, the purity of his life, and the native elegance of his manners soon recommended him as an associate and a friend; and to whose good offices he was principally indebted for his future advancement in life.'—*Ibid.* p. 38.

These much-talked-of manners of Dr. Hurd set the reader speculating. Manners as an art have, we suspect, rather retrograded. They require a more undisturbed theatre for their exercise than we can afford now. People are shouldered in crowds, interrupted or afraid of interruption in their best formed sentences. There is a hurry and impatience in the world which stands in the way of this 'elegance.' We go at a quicker pace, the stately minuet has changed into a whirl. We think it will be observed still that a good manner, wherever we see it, is not associated with a busy temperament. Hurd was 'never captivated with the fine notion of a busy man.' He never allowed himself to be run away with; he could not enjoy society where the idea of bustle could interpose itself. He thought on the subject, and went into the sources of real social pleasure, and found order and rhythm to lie at the root. His common-place book says:—

'It takes much from the pleasure of conversation (though I know not whether it has been observed) that men do not speak *in time*, i.e. with the same degree of rapidity or slowness. When the succession of ideas, and consequently of words, in the hearer is considerably different from that of the speaker, the attention of the former is oppressed and fatigued by the effort to conform his own habit of thinking and speaking to that of the latter, that is, the conversation becomes unpleasing.'—*Ibid.* p. 283.

Madame D'Arblay, who later in his life entertained him at her table at Windsor, reports:—

'The excellent Bishop and Mr. Smelt again dined with us. The Bishop preferred our quiet table to the crowd now belonging to that of the equerries. We had some very good treatises upon society between him and Mr. Smelt. He protested he never chose to meet more than six, and thought all added to that number created confusion and destroyed elegance.'—*Ibid.* p. 169.

She had, on first introduction, been somewhat alarmed by his appearance and air, 'dignified, placid, grave, and mild, but cold and rather distant,' though alive to his being 'extremely well bred;' but very soon the harmony of his *tout ensemble* fascinated her.

'Piety and goodness are so marked on his countenance, which is truly a fine one, that he has been named, and very justly, "The Beauty of Holiness."

Indeed, in face, manner, demeanour, and conversation, he seems precisely what a bishop should be, and what would make a looker-on, were he not a bishop, and a see vacant, call out, "Take Dr. Hurd! that is the man."—*Ibid.* p. 161.

Though women occupied very little of his thoughts, and whenever they did, it was to keep them pretty rigidly in a subordinate place, this same manner told upon them. Courtesy and suavity are in fact very soothing qualities—it is a pity that they are so generally gone out of fashion. How tenderly do people look back upon an amiable deportment—upon a winning smile; it is gratifying to be made the subject even of mere social solicitude. We all remember the time when our ruffled souls, wearied with all sorts of rough encounters with the world, have felt the ineffable charm of being smoothed down as it were by some gracious presence—of being listened to with deference, our opinion sought for, our feelings considered. As things now are, it is an accomplishment that more commonly belongs to women; when we look for examples amongst our acquaintance, the thoughts are apt to rest on some fair centre of an admiring circle. But there was certainly a touch of the feminine, which is different from effeminacy, in the finest gentleman of the age we speak of. Under this softness, indeed essential to it, lies a clear perception of character, in women instinctive, in men more from reflection. Hurd clearly occupied himself much on the moral and intellectual qualities of those with whom he conversed. A very curious instance of this is given in the following reminiscence of an old lady:—

'My grandmother, Mrs. John Parsons, used to tell the following anecdote of the Bishop. She described his manners as particularly soft and winning, his voice as low and musical. He was fond of conversing with her, and answering her inquiries about the Court. Shortly after his arrival at Hartlebury, she said to him one day as they were sitting together, "How do you think your pupil, his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, will turn out?" "My dear cousin," the Bishop replied, laying his peculiarly small white hand upon her arm, "I can hardly tell; either the most polished gentleman, or the most accomplished blackguard in Europe; possibly an admixture of both."—*Ibid.* p. 378.

This story of his cool judgment of the Prince, his pupil, is characteristic of the calmly phlegmatic, and we think also of the studious temper. Commerce with books mainly, has a remarkably sedative effect, and disposes men to a certain fatalism, viewing careers as in a glass, and not allowing the passions to be disturbed by their own oracles.

But it was not upon all that the light of these graceful manners shone. Hurd was a scholar, and as such had no patience with the dull and the ill-informed; even in the highest company he complains of it. After dining with Lord Mansfield, he writes:—



\* However, I dined afterwards with him, and met three lords and the young Prince Poniatowski, nephew to the King of Poland, whose adventure has lately made so much noise. Our conversation turned upon Tokay and other Hungarian wines. And this is called keeping the best company!—*Ibid.* p. 111.

And Cradock writes :—

‘Of all the men I ever knew, Hurd, as a country divine, carried the loftiest carriage. No person at times in highest life looked with more disdain on little folks below, or, to speak more correctly, on unlearned folks.’—*Ibid.* p. 126.

He preferred solitude to uncongenial society; congratulated himself on the badness of the roads in his neighbourhood, and informed Warburton, then Bishop of Gloucester, who came to see him at Thurcaston, that there was no one in his neighbourhood whom he would care to meet.

“What,” says the Bishop, “are all the good houses that I see around me here utterly uninhabited? Let us take our horses and beat up some of their quarters. I have no doubt but several will be well inclined to be friendly and sociable.” “I certainly cannot refuse attending on your lordship anywhere.” Accordingly they waited upon five gentlemen whom I had the pleasure to know, and they all kindly accepted an invitation to take a family dinner at Thurcaston. When I heard of this at Leicester, I determined to call on Mr. Hurd, who received me with great cordiality. “Why, Sir,” said I, “there is nothing talked of but your gaiety; it has even reached your friend Dr. Bickham at Loughborough.” “I don’t doubt it,” replied he, “and if you will pass the day with me, I will treat you with the remains of the festival, and give you an account of all particulars. I can assure you I was at first alarmed as to the provision that could be made by my little household; but all the company were disposed to be pleased. The Bishop was in the highest spirits; and when the gentlemen took leave of me in the hall, they went so far as to declare that, “They thought they had never passed a much pleasanter day.” “And, as you have been so successful, Sir,” I ventured to add, “in this first effort, I have no doubt but the experiment will soon be repeated.” Mr. Hurd was silent.—*Ibid.* p. 71.

It confirms our view of the honours paid to learning a hundred years ago, that these country squires should so gladly accept hospitalities from a country parson, who gave himself airs, and treated them with disdain; and be thus at his call whenever he pleased to invite them. Hurd’s sympathies, however, were never dormant towards learning and literary effort; even with that greatest trial and test of forbearance, the vain *littérateur*, who obtrudes his manuscripts on his friends, he could be patient.

‘The indefatigable Sir David is translating Minutius Felix, and writing notes. Of the *last*, I have a large farrago in my hands, and am to keep them, I suppose, till his Arch-Critic arrives. This Sir David is a good, well-intentioned man, has learning and sense, but is withal immoderately vain; which I conclude, not from his writing so much, (for then how should another friend of yours escape?) but from his teasing his friends so immoderately with his MSS. However, with all his imperfections upon his head, give me a writer—an animal that is now become a *rara avis*, and much to be stared at, even in our learned universities.’—*Ibid.* p. 140.

His poor curate at Thurstaston, Mr. Ball, groaned under the sense of being on the north of his good opinion. 'I do not pretend to be very learned,' he said, 'but I have never been treated with such distance, or rather disdain.' The good man had to be soothed to remain in a scene of such discouragement, but was rewarded for his forbearance when the first use Hurd made of preferment was to give 'poor Ball' a living.

Hurd had a strong sense of the claims of those about him. Crodock writes:—

'From the time I first knew Hurd at Thurstaston until I visited him as bishop in Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury, I do not recollect one discordant circumstance in his family. He was, of course, very careful about character, and he had very little intercourse with the world; but the same persons remained, and I do not recollect any one of them as unfaithful, nor do I ever remember the least complaint. To be sure, he was himself strictly good, but he was always upon his guard.'—*Ibid.* p. 72.

He was remarkable for his kindness to all in any way associated with his early days who had helped his first start in life; and we notice that his friends had that reliance on him, when their feelings and personal interests most wrought on them, which is so genuine a test of the real estimation in which a man is held. Warburton solemnly commended his wife to his care, in his will, and Mr. and Mrs. Allen both emphatically obtained his promise that he should read the funeral service over them.

In 1756 Hurd had taken the college living of Thurstaston in Leicestershire, celebrated by Mason as 'Low Thurstaston's sequestered bowers,' where he assumes his friend to be 'distant from Promotion's view,' an opinion in which Craddock differs from the poet.

He was thought to preach good sermons, and was a believer in them, as all good preachers must be. Disputing the truth of the saying, that 'Locke cared not for sermons,' he says, 'Mr. Locke was too wise to give himself these airs,' though he goes on to characterise the sort of discourses 'slight pulpit harangues' which had probably excited the philosopher's disgust. He is said to have sometimes preached Bourdaloue to his country parishioners, reading from the French copy, and turning it into good English as he went along; if so, we cannot much wonder at the story given in Lady Huntingdon's memoirs quoted by Mr. Kilvert to illustrate his liberality.

'The venerable Dr. Hurd, Bishop of Worcester, being in the habit of preaching frequently, had observed a poor man remarkably attentive, and made him some little presents. After a while he missed his humble auditor, and, meeting him, said, "John, how is it that I do not see you in the aisle as usual?" John with some hesitation replied: "My lord, I hope you will not be offended, and I will tell you the truth. I went the other day to hear the Methodists; and I understand their plain words so much better, that I have attended them ever

since." The Bishop put his hand into his pocket, and gave him a guinea, with words to this effect: "God bless you; go where you can receive the greatest profit to your soul."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

On his being appointed, in 1765, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, through the instrumentality of Mr. Yorke, who persevered in pressing the office upon him which was three times declined, his biographer tells us—

'As a preacher, his manner was calm, dignified, and impressive. His discourses, though not marked by force and energy, had yet a mild persuasiveness, and a tone of gentle insinuation, which, joined to frequent originality of thought, and constant exactness of method, peculiarly recommended him to his cultivated and refined audience at Lincoln's Inn. They had also the merit, no inconsiderable one at that period, of being (as he recommends it to his clergy, in his first Charge, to make theirs) "wholly Christian."—*Ibid.* pp. 201, 202.

These sermons were printed. Modern readers think them dull. They were at the time commended for their *method*—a very good thing, but which should not stand foremost in the review of them—and were extolled also for their 'acuteness, originality, 'their vein of genuine piety, and simple unaffected elegance of 'style.' It is probably more correct praise that they fell in exactly with the views and requirements of his hearers.

In 1744 he was made Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, an appointment which George the Third attributed entirely to his admiration of his 'Moral and Political Dialogues,' having never seen him till he came to kiss hands. Hurd was no vulgar seeker of preferment, but Mr. Kilvert thinks it most probable that the royal mind had been unconsciously swayed by the representations of the three staunch friends, Lord Mansfield, Mr. Charles Yorke, and Bishop Warburton. On this occasion he writes to his great friend Dr. Balguy, with a request that he will preach the consecration sermon:—

'Our good Bishop of Gloucester overflows in his joy on this occasion. By the way, he is so much considered at Court, that I believe he will have the disposal of my archdeaconry, in spite of the Court harpies. I expect every day to have to resign it into his hands. This will make him very happy, and is in my opinion but a just compliment, though an uncommon one, to his eminent merit. . . .

'Lichfield is on all accounts an eligible see, the value about eighteen hundred pounds a year. This I had both from Lord North and the Archbishop.

'I have a hundred things to say to you, and therefore come hither as soon as you can. I am pestered with civilities from all quarters; but one heartfelt congratulation from such a friend as you is of more worth than a thousand well-penned compliments.'—*Ibid.* p. 123.

Two years after, he was entrusted with the difficult office, before alluded to, of preceptor to the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, an appointment which might very likely be due to the king's approbation of his political and moral prin-

ciples, a good opinion confirmed by his lectures on prophecy preached at Lincoln's Inn. There is no evidence of his having particularly enjoyed his office, though at first he describes 'the young princes (I do not say it for form's sake)' as 'extremely pleasing,' going on to project a plan of studies, for which he asks Dr. Balguy's advice. Little further is told us of this part of his life; that he found it irksome is to be inferred from the following passage in a letter to Dr. Balguy:—

'I wish you, dear Sir, a pleasant summer between your two delicious residences of Alton and Winchester. Here am I chained on the banks of the Thames, for my sins, no doubt, as other culprits are.'—*Ibid.* p. 132.

In 1781, on the death of Dr. Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, he received the very next morning by special messenger from Windsor the appointment to that see, with the Clerkship of the Closet. His first act was to put the palace ('Hartlebury Castle') into complete repair. He had, if not a taste, a feeling of the importance of state, which probably belongs especially to men who have risen in life. Hurd is said to have retained certain humble features about the place with the design of reminding himself always of his homely origin, but he lived in state. When he went to the Hot Wells he was attended by a dozen servants, in contrast with Warburton, who was carelessly indifferent to appearances, and would make the same journey on a scrub pony.

It has been said that George the Third loved mediocrities—that, like all 'dull men,' he suspected superior people. His unbounded confidence in Hurd would certainly have been brought as a proof of the assertion, if the writer who makes it had cared to acquaint himself with the more respectable phases of society in the time of which he treats. The class of superior people who do not like things as they are, who find themselves at odds with existing circumstances, who crave for change, no doubt were little to the king's taste; and that order of intelligence—in its equal degrees of good sense, caution, and prejudice, representing conservatism—which makes the best of things as they stand, and never thinks of innovations, was very likely in the gathering discontents of his time to win his confidence. The world had been very good to Hurd; his was not a large enough mind to quarrel with a state of things which fitted him so well, which brought out what powers he possessed, which regarded him with respect and reverence. Those men who strike not only the good old king, but most men, as *wise*, are in fact those who make the best of things as they are, without launching out into untried seas of change and reform. There must be progress, but it is not those whom we most implicitly trust who bring it about. We all of us have faith in mediocrity, because we all of

us have felt its reliable and comfortable qualities; it needed no courtly or unworthy arts therefore for Hurd to agree in all points with his royal master—every interview would enhance their mutual respect and sympathy. But such mediocrity must, we maintain, keep to its derivation, and must not be confounded with anything inferior. If George the Third, on account of this same mediocrity, pressed upon Hurd a *third* promotion, and offered him without hesitation the Archbishopric of Canterbury, Hurd showed his moderation in a noble manner by at once declining it. It was a fine independent act, even though motives of a personal nature may have influenced him. Few men really know what is for their happiness, few men can deliberately trust their own judgment, so far as to give up what the world considers an advantage; few men have *self-respect* enough to renounce any portion of the world's respect; their own approbation, their own content, is not an equivalent for the loss of worldly consideration. It was one of Hurd's finest qualities that he could trust himself and take his own stand. Years before, he had jestingly reproved his friend Dr. Balguy for wishing promotion for him, and shown that it was not for a Churchman's good to wish for it.

'Aristotle and you are a couple of choice philosophers. Instead of endeavouring to allay the fever of the passions, you encourage and promote it. But we must have something to hope or to seek; and are there no objects of desire or means of activity but deaneries and bishoprics? Are there no books to read or to write? Is there no such thing as conversation or amusement?'

—Or, to be grave,

Have we no friend to serve, or soul to save?

Will not all this keep a divine from sinking into insipidity and disgust? \* \* \* But say this of Churchmen if you can. Is a man likely to be the better divine, or to cultivate one useful quality the more, for aspiring to Canterbury? I trow not, and I defy you to make good so outrageous a paradox.—*Ibid.* pp. 106, 107.

It must be noted that Dr. Balguy so far shared these views that he also subsequently refused the Bishopric of Gloucester. Having thus slighted Canterbury in the distance, we find Dr. Hurd fourteen years after writing to the same friend.

'Upon the death of Archbishop Cornwallis, May 1, 1783, Bishop Hurd was pressed by the King, with many gracious expressions, to accept the archbishopric of Canterbury. This, however, as he himself states, "he humbly begged leave to decline, as a charge not suited to his temper and talents, and much too heavy for him to sustain, especially in these times." "The King," he adds, "was pleased not to take offence at this freedom, and then to enter into some confidential conversation on the subject." The Bishop, in relating the circumstance to Mr. Nichols, said, "I took the liberty of telling his Majesty that several much greater men than myself had been contented to die Bishops of Worcester, and that I wished for no higher preferment." The result was that the archbishopric was given to Dr. Moore, Bishop of Bangor, it has been stated, upon the recommendation of Bishop Hurd. On the 13th of

the month he writes to Dr. Balguy: "I am truly happy, as you suppose, in having escaped Lambeth, though the offer of it could not but be flattering to me. A friend of yours would not have said, *Nolo archiepiscopari*; but the King knows his Bishops well, and has provided better for us."—*Ibid.* p. 146.

This refusal did not in any degree affect the friendship between the bishop and the king, of which there is one curious instance in the king's having actually decided on removing his family to Hartlebury Castle in case of invasion. Twice in this memoir invasion seems to have been considered imminent. In his youth, in the year 1743-4, we find Hurd writing from Cambridge:—

'Nothing is talked of here but an invasion from the French. The Chevalier is at Paris, and we are to expect him here in a short time. Whatever there may be in this news, it seems to have consternated the ministry. The Tower is trebly guarded, and so is Saint James's; and the soldiery have orders to be ready for action at an hour's warning. They are hasting, it seems, from all quarters of the kingdom, to London. I saw a regiment yesterday going through Newmarket. After all, I apprehend very little from this terror; it seems a politic contrivance of the French to give a diversion to our men, and keep the English out of Germany. Let me know what is said in your part of the world.'—*Ibid.* p. 20.

And just sixty years later, in 1803, George the Third writes to his now aged friend, who had placed his house at his service.

'MY DEAR GOOD BISHOP,—It has been thought by some of my friends, that it will not be necessary to remove my family. Should I be under so painful a necessity, I do not know where I could place them with so much satisfaction to myself, and, under Providence, with so much security, as with yourself and my friends at Worcester. It does not appear probable that there will be any occasion for it, as I do not think the unhappy man who threatens us will dare to venture among us; neither do I wish you to make any preparation for us: but I thought it right to give you this information. I remain, my dear good Bishop,

'GEORGE.'—*Ibid.* p. 189.

As far as the world had honours to bestow, Dr. Hurd may be said to have attained them. His is an instance of rising in the most real sense. He had not only the externals, but the more solid and intimate circumstances of elevation; and it was the homage of the day to learning (or what had the reputation of such) and good sense, of which our own time does not offer similar examples. Not that distinctions in his person are very dazzling to the imagination. He was so matter-of-fact, made so sober an estimate of men and things, that everything must seem matter-of-fact about him. All is easy and common-place, and not very interesting. Perhaps, too, the old king had so much homely humanity in his nature, his tastes were so essentially domestic and private, that he could not lift people up by his more intimate notice, but rather proved his own yearning for the fuller and freer life of common destiny, by descending to the level of quiet, ordinary, home-bred people.



No doubt the much-talked-of manner won the king. Dr. Hurd's habitual thoughtful gravity would mould this into the model deportment for a bishop. His well-regulated mind always secured this adaptation. Thus the court learned to feel a reverential confidence in him. It is pleasant to find that good and *spirituelle* old lady, Mrs. Delany, seeking his counsel in her depression.

'This morning (writes Madame D'Arblay) I met the Bishop of Worcester at Mrs. Delany's; he was very serious, unusually so, but Mrs. D. was cheerful. He soon left us, and she then told me she had been ill in the night, and had been led to desire some very solemn conversation with the good Bishop, who is her friend of many years' standing, and was equally intimate with her lost darling the Duchess of Portland . . . she had been discoursing on the end of all things with the Bishop . . . her mind was relieved and her spirit cheered by the conference . . . he had spoken peace to her fears, and joy to her best hopes.'—*Ibid.* pp. 160, 161.

His was, in fact, a pious and devout mind, though constitutionally cold, of which he seems to have been himself aware, for we find in his common-place book speculations on the best mode of treating this temperament.

'They who have calm, cold, and sluggish affections, should endeavour to warm them by reading the Scriptures. If this expedient fail, I would not advise them to have recourse to the *Masters of the Spiritual Life*, as they are called, to enliven their piety. For persons of that temperament will not, perhaps cannot, feel those flights and raptures, however well founded, where the heart is more tender. Their efforts will probably end in hypocrisy or disappointment. Their better way, I think, will be, to study the evidences of true religion in sound reasoners on that subject, their conviction of which will produce a firm faith. And such a faith will have all the effects of love (though not so speedily or certainly perhaps) in leading them to a good life, the end of true Christian religion, *i.e.* of true piety. The spiritual life of the *pictist* may be pleasanter and more rapturous, but will be equally solid in the *rationalist*, *i.e.* the believer, who is such on the grounds of fair reasonable inquiry, and not of feelings and transports, of which his complexion may render him incapable.'—*Ibid.* p. 263.

In his correspondence with Dr. Balguy, we find the great subjects of Christian doctrine frequently discussed with a thought and earnestness which impresses us favourably. In a long letter from Dr. Balguy, mainly on the subject of toleration, in which he was more liberal than his times, we find allusion to some tracts of the time, to which he calls the Bishop's attention.

'It appears to me unquestionable that the death of Christ is the appointed means of our redemption; but the reasons of this appointment may probably lie too deep for our comprehension. To suppose that we know them all would be presumption, and we can know none of them unless from the declarations of Scripture, which, as I think, has not very explicitly declared them.'—*Ibid.* p. 165.

To which the Bishop replies characteristically:—

‘I agree with you that the blood, or, as you express it, the *death* of Christ, is the appointed means of our redemption; of the reason of that appointment I am not anxious to inquire, but I think a solicitude to investigate the reasons inclines many to reject the means.’—*Ibid.* p. 166.

We do not quote these passages—and there are many like them—for their intrinsic value, but to show what were the subjects of thought and mutual interest between these friends. Mr. Kilvert, in speaking of his relative, Richard Kilvert, the Bishop’s chaplain, gives testimony to their constant study of Holy Scripture together; and pious notices in advancing age, with apt and simple references to the inspired Word, show a mind watchful and thankful. His common-place book has many reflections, as it were calmly preparing himself for the end, and noting the inevitable accompaniments of even a happy old age.

‘Among the inconveniences of a long life, one is, that it brings us acquainted with the moral as well as physical defects of ourselves and others. This unwelcome discovery unfits and indisposes us for society, at a time when we most want the refreshments of it. But let us not complain. It serves, too, by the wise disposal of a good Providence, to dissolve, or loosen at least, our connexion with this world, till we are somewhat prepared to take a final leave of it. . . .

‘How comfortable is the idea of living under the constant eye and care of an Almighty and all-gracious Providence! and with what horror must we regard a fatherless world, and the sad condition of being exposed to what the poet calls

Omnipotens fortuna et ineluctabile fatum.

Virg. *Æneid.* viii. 334.

‘Why puzzle and perplex ourselves about the intricacies of Providence? which, however inscrutable to us, we know to be real, and not general only, but particular, since a sparrow falls not to the ground without our Father, nay, and that the hairs of our head are all numbered. (Matt. x. 29, 30, and Luke xii. 6, 7.) Why, then, be alternately elated or dejected at what takes place in the mysterious economy and shifting scene of this world? “O ye of little faith,” *ὀλιγόπιστοι!*”—*Ibid.* p. 192.

He died in 1808, at the great age of eighty-eight, from a gradual decay of strength; his health had never been strong, and all his life he was subject to serious attacks of illness.

It is no wonder, after such a life of success, that we should be told of little vanities, of a willingness to receive the flatteries of acquaintances and friends, of occasional testiness in old age, especially where his own particular speciality was concerned. Mr. Cradock writes—

‘When Mr. Mainwaring paid his last visit to Dr. Hurd, then Bishop of Worcester, it was his public day. His Lordship, always rather irritable, was now become considerably captious and peevish, and, Mr. Mainwaring at dinner

giving some account of the French emigrants he had seen in passing through Worcester, his Lordship suddenly exclaimed, laying down his knife and fork, "Have I lived to hear the Lady Margaret's Professor of Cambridge call it emigrant?" The company was struck with astonishment, and the professor only coolly replied, "My Lord, I am certainly aware that the *i* in the Latin of *emigro* is long, but modern usage—" "Nay, Sir, if you come to modern usage, I can certainly say no more." Mr. Mainwaring, considering his Lordship's age and increasing infirmities, said no more.—*Ibid.* p. 127.

But these and like infirmities we ought surely to be indulgent to; for if we live long enough, it is pretty certain we shall all fall into kindred ones.

It is as a life, as a characteristic of an age, that we have treated Dr. Hurd, not as an author. He was one of the many who influence their own time, in distinction from the few who can hope for a lasting rule over men's minds. The neglect of his works, of which Mr. Kilvert complains, will probably be permanent. What Hurd himself somewhere says is very true, that every age must have its own books, and the truth told in its own way, even though less forcibly than by preceding writers; and Hurd suited his own time, but not ours. As a critic, his influence was mainly for good. He steadily opposed the fashion of grandiloquent writing, which came in in his time, and the world has come round to his opinion, though not, perhaps, in its strength and prejudice of expression.

'Simplicity in writing, practised by the best writers ancient and modern, has been growing out of fashion in England (I write this in 1800) for some time. The pompous, or what may be called the *swaggering*, manner, was introduced by Bolingbroke; continued, or rather heightened, by Junius and Johnson; till now it is become the only style that pleases the mob of readers, and aspires to be taken notice of in reviews and magazines.'—*Ibid.* p. 296.

Of Gibbon he writes—

'As to Gibbon, I have read a part of his third volume. Though a writer of sense, parts, and industry, I read him with little pleasure. His loaded and luxuriant style is disgusting to the last degree; and his work is polluted everywhere by the most immoral as well as irreligious insinuations.'—*Ibid.* p. 167.

Of Burke, of whose fantastic modes of expression he elsewhere complains—

'Burke's writings are such as may be expected from a man long habituated to extemporary harangues in a popular assembly, and perhaps for that reason afford a presumption that they are properly written to answer his end; as to the multitude of words, Cicero, on the like occasion, would have used as many, only he would have put them together in a better method and in a purer style.'—*Ibid.* p. 179.

Johnson he calls a pedant, and can't write of him with patience.

'Boswell's "Life of Samuel Johnson" exhibits a striking likeness of a confident, over-weening, dictatorial pedant, though of parts and learning; and of a weak, shallow, submissive admirer of such a character, deriving a vanity from that very admiration.'—*Ibid.* p. 254.

Simplicity is his constant watchword. He detects the want of it in the wits that preceded Addison, in many of the ancients, as well as in the new lights who were clouding the fame of his own great example. 'I have lived,' he writes pathetically, 'to see the day when some have called in question the claim of Addison to be a good writer in prose,' adding, 'and of Pope to be a good poet.' His enthusiasm for Addison was a kindred passion with his friendship for Warburton. They were the two excesses of his life. His edition of the great essayist marks the difference between the criticism of his day and our own. Verbal criticism is with us mainly confined to the dead languages. We do not pick the sentences of our contemporaries to pieces; we leave men to express themselves, as we say, according to their genius, keeping no particular watch upon words and phrases. Few, we suspect, analyse very exactly why they are pleased, though we still confer the praise of a classical style on composition where a full meaning is rendered in clear musical English. But men would think it derogatory to wait upon an English writer as Hurd does on Addison, noting his felicities, detecting minute inaccuracies, fondly exulting over any particular success. Such criticism belongs to a reading as opposed to a writing age. The critic of a hundred years ago is a writer now. We will give an example or two of this obsolete style of criticism, with Hurd's Addison before us; and first, one sentence will show the 'word-picking' department. Addison writes:—

'It is impossible to enumerate the evils which arise from those arrows that fly in the dark.'

Hurd's comments:—

'This sentence had been more exact, and less languid, if he had said, "Innumerable evils arise from those arrows that fly in the dark."'

Addison says:—

'How many a pretty gentleman's knowledge lies all within the verge of the court?'

In a note we find:—

'*Many a man* is used in familiar discourse for *many men*. This way of speaking is anomalous, and seemingly absurd, but may in some sort be accounted for by observing that the indefinite particle "*a*" means "*one*" in reference to *more*; so that "*many a man*" is the same thing as *one man of many*, &c.'

Addison speaks of Sir Roger's chief companion:—

'Who has lived at his house in the nature of a chaplain.'

The note, fearful lest so great an example should mislead, appends a caution:—

'The word "*nature*" is used here a little licentiously; he should have said, "in the *office*" or the "*quality*" of a chaplain.'

Many of the notes, however, take a higher stand, and might, we think, be valuable to the student as going into the causes of beauty in style, telling us how we are pleased. Thus, in Addison we read:—

'It is there said [in the Alcoran] that the Angel Gabriel took Mahomet out of his bed one morning to give him a sight of all things in the seven heavens, in paradise, and in hell, which the Prophet took a distinct view of; and after having held ninety thousand conferences with God, was brought back again to his bed. All this, says the Alcoran, was transacted in so small a space of time, that Mahomet, at his return, found his bed still warm.'

On which the note remarks:—

'Which the Prophet took a distinct view of. This way of throwing the *preposition* to the end of a sentence is among the peculiarities of Mr. Addison's manner, and was derived from his nice ear. The secret deserves to be explained. The English tongue is naturally grave and majestic. The *rhythm* corresponds to the genius of it, and runs almost, whether we will or no, into iambs. But the continuity of this solemn measure has an ill effect, where the subject is not of moment. Mr. Addison's delicate ear made him sensible of this defect in the rhythm of our language, and suggested to him the proper cure for it, which was to break the continued iambic measure, especially at the end of a sentence, where the weight of it would be most felt, by a *preposition* or other short word, of no emphasis in the sense, and without accent, thrown into that part; whence a trochee being introduced into the place of an iambus, would give that air of negligence, and what the French call "*légèreté*," which in a work of gaiety or elegance is found so taking. For instance, had the author said, "of which the Prophet took a distinct view," the metre had been wholly iambic, or, what is worse, would have been loaded with a spondee in the last foot, and the accent must have fallen with solemnity on the word *view*. But by reserving the preposition "*of*" to the end of the sentence he gains this advantage, that "*view of*" becomes a trochee, and the ear is not only relieved by the variety, but escapes the "ictus" of a too important close. For the same reason, he frequently terminates a sentence or a paragraph by such unpretending phrases as "*of it*," "*of him*," "*to her*," "*from them*." . . . In the formal style it is evident this liberty should be sparingly used, but in conversation, in letters, in narrative, and universally in all the lighter forms of composition, the Addisonian termination, as we may call it, has an extreme grace.'—Addison's Works, vol. iii.

We fully agree with all this, but apprehend that the language has drifted away from the form, so that the habitual use of the preposition as a termination would now be a mannerism. The subject of English composition is so seldom treated now with this close analysis, that we are tempted to give one further

extract, trusting to its finding interest with those who like to trace sensations to their causes. No teaching can make men write musical prose if they have not certain natural felicities of taste and ear, but care and study may turn these precious gifts to vastly greater advantage.

'*A man who has any relish for fine writing.*' This mystery of *fine writing* (more talked of than understood) consists chiefly in *three* things. 1. In a choice of *fit* terms. 2. In such a *construction* of them, as agrees to the grammar of the language, in which we write. And 3. In a pleasing *order and arrangement* of them. By the *first* of these qualities, a style becomes what we call *elegant*: by the *second*, *exact*: and, by the *third*, *harmonious*. Each of these qualities may be possessed, by itself; but they must concur, to form a finished style.

'Mr. Addison was the *first*, and is still, perhaps, the *only*, English writer, in whom these three requisites are found together, in, almost, an equal degree of perfection. It is, indeed, one purpose of these cursory notes, to show, that, in some few instances, he has transgressed, or rather, neglected the strict rules of *grammar*; which yet, in general, he observes with more care, than any other of our writers. But, in the *choice of his terms* (which is the most essential point of all), and in the *numbers of his style*, he is almost faultless, or rather, admirable.

'It will not be easy for the reader to comprehend the merit of Mr. Addison's prose, in these three respects, if he has not been conversant in the best rhetorical writings of the ancients; and especially in those parts of Cicero's and Quintilian's works, which treat of what they call *composition*. But, because the *harmony* of his style is exquisite, and this praise is peculiar to himself, it may be worth while to consider, in what it chiefly consists.

'1. This secret charm of *numbers* is effected by a certain arrangement of words, in the *same sentence*: that is, by putting such words together, as read easily, and are pronounced without effort; while, at the same time, they are so tempered by different *sounds and measures*, as to affect the ear with a sense of *variety*, as well as *sweetness*. As, to take the first sentence in the following essay: "*Our sight is the most perfect and most delightful of all our senses.*" If you alter it thus:—"Our sight is the *perfectest* and most delightful of all our senses." Though the change be only of one word, the difference is very sensible; *perfectest*, being a word of difficult pronunciation, and rendered still harsher by the subsequent word *most*, which echoes to the termination *est*.

'Or, again, read thus—"Our sight is the most perfect and most *pleasing* of all our senses." Here, the predominance of the vowel *e*, and the alliteration of the two adjectives, *perfect* and *pleasing*, with the repetition of the superlative sign "*most*," occasions too great a *sameness* or similarity of sound in the constituent parts of this sentence.

'Lastly, read thus:—"Our sight is the most *complete* and most delightful *sense we have.*"—But then you hurt the measure or *quantity*, which, in our language, is determined by the accent: as will appear from observing of what *feet* either sentence consists.

"Our sight-is the most-comple-te-and most-delight-ful sense-we have." Here, except at the second foot, which is an anapaest, the rest are all of one kind, *i.e.* iambics. Read now with Mr. Addison—"Our sight-is the most-perfect-and most delight-ful of all-our senses."—And you see how the rhythm is varied by the intermixture of other feet, besides that the short redundant syllable, *we*, gives to the close, a slight and negligent air, which has a better effect, in this place, than the proper iambic foot.

'2. A sentence may be of a *considerable length*: and then the rhythm arises



from such a composition, as breaks the whole into different parts ; and consults at the same time, the melodious flow of each. As in the second period of the same paper,—“It fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas, converses with its objects at the greatest distance, and continues the longest in action without being tired or satiated with its proper enjoyments.”

‘A single sentence should rarely consist of more than three members, and the rhythm is most complete, when these rise upon, and exceed, each other in length and fulness of sound, till the whole is rounded by a free and measured close. In this view, the rhythm of the sentence here quoted, might be improved by shortening the first member, or lengthening the second, as thus :—“it fills the mind with the most ideas, converses with its objects at the greatest distance,” &c. Or thus—“it fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas, has the advantage of conversing with its objects at the greatest distance,” &c.

‘These alterations are suggested only to explain my meaning, and not to intimate, that there is any fault in the sentence as it now stands. It is not necessary, nay it would be wrong, to tune every period into the completest harmony : I would only signify to the reader, what that arrangement of a complicated period is, in which the harmony is most complete. We have numberless instances in Mr. Addison’s writing ; as in the next of his papers on the imagination—“the eye has room to range abroad, to expatiate at large on the immensity of its views, and to lose itself amidst the variety of objects that offer themselves to its observation.”

‘The instance, here given, is liable to no objection. But there is danger, no doubt, least this attention to rhythm should betray the writer, insensibly, into some degree of languor and redundancy in his expression. And it cannot be denied, that Mr. Addison himself has, sometimes, fallen into this trap. But the *general rule* holds, nevertheless ; and care is only to be taken, that in aiming at a beauty of one kind, we do not overlook another of equal, or, as in this case, of greater importance.—*Addison’s Works*, vol. iv. pp. 331—333.

It is not a little curious that, with all this keen appreciation of grace, and clearness of diction, Dr. Hurd should, on the occasion when he would most wish to excel, have made a signal failure. He had a taste for inscriptions, which demand a particularly terse, correct, and harmonious style ; and distinguished himself by some excellent Latin performances in this line, noted by his biographer—himself well known for his admirable inscriptive Latin. As a matter of course, Hurd was deputed to compose the epitaph on his friend Warburton, and we may be sure would summon all his skill to the work. But when terseness is the one thing aimed at, it seems always to give a writer the slip, or betray him into some blunder or other. How it is that it is so difficult to write a decent epitaph has to be explained, but we suspect all who have tried know it as a fact. Here is Hurd’s on Warburton :—

‘To the memory of  
WILLIAM WARBURTON, D. D.  
for more than XIX years Bishop of this See.  
A Prelate  
of the most sublime Genius, and exquisite  
Learning.  
Both which Talents  
he employed through a long life,

in the support,  
of what he firmly believed,  
the Christian Religion ;

and

of what he esteemed the best establishment of it,  
the Church of England.

He was born at Newark-upon-Trent,

Dec. 24, 1698 ;

was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester, Jan. 20, 1760 ;

died at his Palace, in this City, June 7, 1779,

and was buried near this place.

*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. v. pp. 635-6.

A transparent failure certainly, on which two very just comments have been made. Dr. Warton notices the *two talents* as an improper expression : 'His Genius and Learning are called two talents, but Learning is an acquirement.' And Cradock writes :—

'After his death Hurd wrote his epitaph, which was placed against a pillar in Gloucester Cathedral. A brother Bishop, Dr. Thurlow, once said to me afterwards, "Could your friend find nothing better to say, in honour of his former idol, than that he died in the belief of what he conceived to be Christianity" ! I gave a copy of Hurd's epitaph soon after it was put up to some learned dignitaries, and one could scarcely believe it was exactly copied.'—*Cradock*, vol. iv. p. 205.

Mr. Kilvert concludes his volume with an imposing list of Bishop Hurd's works, consisting of criticism, controversy, moral and political dialogues, sermons, and charges, and a variety of tracts. These are already before the public, though not in a very practical form ; Mr. Kilvert adds to them a variety of extracts from the bishop's unpublished record of thought, his common-place book. They show a mind constantly busy in worthy subjects of thought, of considerable power and clearness, and with a wider range of sympathies than perhaps might have been expected ; with the one exception of 'enthusiasm.' We will give an instance or two, though we are drawing to an end of our space. There is, we think, a touch of modern thought in the following passage on illusions :—

'One of the ways by which human life becomes tolerable is through the illusion of hope. It would be a curious subject to inquire how much of what we call *happiness* in this life arises from such sort of illusions. I doubt, if things appeared to us just as they are, we should not only lose a great deal of needful comfort, but deprive ourselves of much useful *instruction*. What child, for instance, would submit to the drudgery of his education, if he were not led on and *deluded*, as we may say, by certain fond and extravagant fancies of the excellence and advantages of learning, much beyond what he finds it to yield to him, when he comes to grow up to years of observation ? But by that time, luckily, *habit* supplies the place of his former *illusion*, and he continues his studies, though he no longer dreams of the prodigious importance of them. The same may be said of the other pursuits of life, such as greatness, wealth,

titles, &c. In short, make all men philosophers, that is, instruct people from their earliest entrance on life to regard things but *for what they are*, and you cut the sinews of all human industry and virtue. We are made happy by shadows here: the *substance* is to be sought in other regions.'—*Life and Correspondence of Bishop Hurd*, p. 268.

In his own line of criticism we find the following tacit apology for the rougher forms of controversy (he is speaking of writers):—

'The views, humours, and characters of, very different. This is not always considered when some are applauded and others condemned, *e.g.* as much of the positive and dogmatic spirit may lie hid in the diffident writer as is expressed in a confident one. The mode of writing makes all the difference, and this may proceed from different causes, and may in either case be justified from them. Would you convince or proselyte the person you write against? The way of insinuation is preferable. Do you despair of this, and would you guard others from being misled by him? The direct and peremptory method is better. Besides, would the decorum of character be preserved if the bold-spirited wrote with the cautious reserve of the timid? But you "like the softer character better:" that is another consideration, and may as well mean your pride as your humility.'—*Ibid.* pp. 294, 295.

On the question of tediousness he says:—'a tedious writer

is one, not who uses many words, whether in long or short sentences; but who uses many words to little purpose. Where the sense keeps pace with the words, though these be numerous, or drawn out into long periods, I am not tired with an author: when his expression goes on, and the sense stands still, I am presently out of patience with him. Of all the great writers of antiquity, Cicero is perhaps the least tedious, and Seneca the most so.'—*Ibid.* p. 289.

He was noted amongst his friends for his skill in drawing historical characters; many of these are given, but at too great length for our purpose. We extract the one of Erasmus, as coming within our limits:—

'Two infirmities in this great man account for all the inconsistencies of his character. These were vanity and timidity. His vanity led him to expose the abuses which his penetration and love of truth had discovered in the Church: for Protestantism, or a free vein of disquisition concerning the then state of religion, was as fashionable in his time as infidelity is become in ours. But as such freedom in writing and speaking was sure to give offence, and could not but be attended with danger, his timidity led him again to palliate or explain away what he had justly advanced. Hence he was obnoxious both to Protestants and Papists. He certainly wished and aimed at a reformation of religion; but he wished, at the same time, that this reformation might be brought about by gentle and pacific means only: a thing impossible after a ferment had been raised in men's minds by his own free writings, and especially by the furious invectives of Luther. If his scheme could have been effected, the mischiefs and miseries (which were innumerable and excessive) of the Reformation had been avoided. It might have been effected if all men had been as prudent and conciliatory as he was disposed to be; but by slow degrees and in a greater compass of time than the passion of the two parties would allow. On the whole, Erasmus was an excellent man as well as writer; and, though the

boisterous hand of Luther did at once what the other had projected, yet it was done the easier for the agreeable and popular information conveyed by Erasmus. And therefore it was truly but coarsely observed, that the one laid the egg which the other hatched.'—*Ibid.* p. 219.

We must now take our leave of Bishop Hurd. If our effort to bring him and his times before our readers should induce them to penetrate into the history of the last century for themselves, our end will have been answered. It has been the fashion with authors and thinkers of the most various aims to cry down the period on which we have been engaged, in its politics, its society, its religion. The reigns of the Georges are held up to popular ridicule and reprobation by a fascinating writer who has seen little in a range of a hundred years but matter for his pungent wit. But people only find what they go to seek. The satirist of our day has gone to the satirists of the past for his pictures of the period he contemns: all times furnish food for such a temper; few, we gladly think, are so barren of good but they can also supply the contrast, to those who will patiently look for it; for worth, and steady principle, and purity of life do not catch the eye as readily as do vanity and folly in high places. These and other kindred virtues may surely be found in the company to which Mr. Kilvert's book has led us, not without ready wit and learning to give them edge and freshness; and these where the satirist would least bid us look for them, in the studies of deans and the palaces of bishops.

---

- ART. III.—1. *Is Educational Reform required in Oxford, and what?* Oxford and London: J. H. & J. Parker. 1859.
2. *Pass and Class. An Oxford Guide-Book through the Courses of Literæ Humaniores, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Law and Modern History.* By MONTAGU BURROWS, M.A. J. H. & J. Parker. 1860.
3. *The Voluntary System applied to Academical Instruction. Suggestions by* D. P. CHASE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, and Principal of St. Mary Hall. J. H. & J. Parker. 1859.
4. *The Voluntary System applied to University Examinations.* By D. P. CHASE, M.A. J. H. & J. Parker. 1859.
5. *Two Letters on the Examinations, to the Rev. the Vice-Chancellor.* By J. P. TWEED, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. J. H. & J. Parker. 1859.
6. *An Inaugural Lecture, delivered by* GOLDWIN SMITH, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. J. H. & J. Parker. 1859.

IN the course of the last fifty years, the University of Oxford has been the scene of three different movements, which have stirred the usually quiet waters of academical life into an unwonted excitement. Ordinarily, nothing can be more still and unmoved than the appearance of the University. Each man has his own work to do, and he has the good sense to do it, and when he has done it, he finds but little time for other occupation. It requires, therefore, a strong necessity, or a master's hand, to evoke the fund of energy which exists, but exists usually in a latent form, except so far as it expends itself in the efficient fulfilment of the daily duties of the place. It was a strong necessity—no other than the apparent necessity of saving the Church from ruin—which co-operated with Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Newman, in producing the great Religious and Theological movement which forms the first of the three movements to which we have referred. The second, which we may call the Constitutional movement, as it had for its object the creation of a new constitution for the University, was forced upon the residents from without. The third, or Educational movement, was the natural product of the general advance and change of thought which has taken place, both within and without the University, in the course of half a century.

I. With the Theological movement we do not here deal; enough that it stirred the University to its depths, that it passed from the University to the Church at large, and that its effects are now felt throughout the length and breadth of England in increased zeal and love to God's service displayed in many a village parsonage, and in the midst of the hitherto unreclaimed masses of our great towns and cities; and in the fact that principles are now universally recognised as axioms which had previously been overlooked and forgotten. But its original home knows it no more. Coldness, deadness, indifference, have taken the place of theological excitement, and 'the great storm of religious controversy,' says Mr. Goldwin Smith, 'through which the University has just passed, has cast the wrecks of her most gifted intellects on every shore.'—P. 34.

II. The origin and progress of the Constitutional movement is known to none better than to the writer whom we have just quoted, and to Professor Stanley, the secretary of the original University Commission. There was a small party in the University, styling itself liberal, which was unable to carry out its pet theories for remoulding and rearranging everything, or at least many things, about them, because they found themselves in a minority amongst their peers. As they did not doubt for a moment that the whole wisdom of the University was centred in themselves, they were unable to endure the tyranny under which they were suffering, and in virtuous indignation,—warmed into action, it was whispered, by a fellowship being refused to an able candidate on the ground of his having, in the opinion of the electors, too large an income to allow him to be eligible,—they appealed to Lord John Russell. Lord John was prepared at a moment's notice to undertake the reform of the universities. He announced his resolution—a Royal Commission should be issued. The Commission was appointed, and it was found that everyone upon it was a party man, more or less committed to the same views, so that the nature of the Report might be easily guessed from the character of the Commissioners and of the Secretary. It was not of course likely that the University authorities would act cordially with such a body. Moreover, there was a doubt hanging over the legality of their acts. Papers of questions were sent out by the Commissioners to persons selected by themselves, so framed as commissioners know how to frame questions which are to produce answers on which to frame a given report. In due time the Report appeared, together with the evidence so collected, and a questionable sketch of the past and present state of the colleges, contributed by Mr. Goldwin Smith. A great stir at once arose in the University. The Report was diligently studied, and its



essence appeared to be this:—That it was the opinion of the Commissioners that the University should no longer govern itself by its Hebdomadal Board and its Convocation, but that it should be controlled by a wise oligarchy, which should direct it aright in spite of its own conservative perversity. This oligarchy was to be found in the Professors, the majority of whom were to be nominated by the Crown, and who were to be the preponderating element in the new governing body. Further, the Collegiate system was to be weakened and depressed in favour of the University, both by taking from the Colleges to give to the Professors, and by permitting young men to lodge freely where they would throughout the town during their academical career, thus raising up an University distinct from the Colleges and Halls which composed it, at the expense of all efficient moral control.<sup>1</sup> ‘Clerical restriction’ and poverty, of course found little favour at the hands of the Commissioners.

What was to be done by those members of the University to whom the modest recommendations of the Commissioners were distasteful? The Proctors proposed the appointment of a mixed delegacy, one-half consisting of Heads of Houses, and the other half of Masters of Arts, to consider the suggestions, and to report upon them. The Heads, being now demented before their fall, refused to acquiesce in the Proctors’ proposal; even the able and far-seeing Dr. Harington, whose unexpected death, which occurred shortly afterwards, was a heavy blow to the University, counselling them in the negative. The Heads appointed a committee of themselves to consider the Commissioners’ recommendations, and invited evidence from the Masters. The Masters resuscitated the Tutors’ Association, which had previously existed under Mr. Jelf’s presidency for the purpose of discussing educational changes, and they appointed Mr. Hansell their chairman. It was a busy time—there was the whole of the ordinary work of the term to be carried on as usual, and in addition there were discussions to be held in

<sup>1</sup> The one-sided character of the Commissioners’ Report was shown in nothing more than in their having no fault to find with the state of the Halls, at the time that they issued their Report. At that time, with the one exception of S. Edmund’s Hall, all the Halls were conducted in such a way as to be a scandal to the University—the only patent scandal then existing at Oxford. Yet the Commissioners were quite blind to their shortcomings, because their theory was that it was the Colleges which produced all the evils of the place, and the Halls were the only representatives of the separate university life which they desired to encourage. It is the less difficult to speak freely of the evils which were at that time embodied in the Halls, because they have now been done away, though not by any action of the Commission. There is no other place in the University, in which young men are now so carefully taught and trained as S. Edmund’s Hall, and S. Alban Hall, and we believe that we may add S. Mary Hall. New Inn Hall still remains to show in what the Commissioners could *not* discover anything with which to find fault.

common-rooms, and reports to be drawn up by committees and sub-committees, occupying almost every evening in the week. Those who took the most prominent part in guiding the deliberations of the Association were Mr. Charles Marriott, Mr. Lake, Mr. Rawlinson, and Mr. Mansel. It was in these deliberations and discussions that Mr. Mansel, whose fame had been hitherto somewhat confined to his college, laid the foundation of his reputation for consummate ability and practical wisdom which he now eminently enjoys. At the same time there appeared one of the wittiest poetical satires which ever poured ridicule on an antagonist, entitled *Phrontisterion*, imitated from Aristophanes, and breathing the Aristophanic spirit, assailing the Commissioners and their scheme, now with broad jest, now with keen irony, and now with a wail of indignation, such as forms the undersong (unheard by some,) of the patriot Athenian's poems. It was published anonymously, but no concealment was made about its author's name. There was no man in Oxford but Mr. Mansel who could have written it. We hope that it will not suffer the usual fate of fugitive pieces. It deserves to live for its intrinsic poetical merits.

Reports were issued by the Tutors' Association on the Constitution of the University, on the Professoriate, and on the Collegiate question, which had considerable effect on after legislation, as Mr. Gladstone was now in power. After a while the Report of the Committee of the Heads of Houses appeared. It contained some good sense, but it did not go nearly as far as had now become necessary in concession. The Heads of Houses had never been conspicuous for knowing what it was that the Masters of Arts wished or meant, and they offered what might once have satisfied but was now rejected with contempt—they were too late.

The most valuable part of this volume, and that was very valuable, was Dr. Pusey's evidence. There was one man in the University whom the Heads in their days of power had set themselves deliberately to crush. The Rector of Exeter, the Principal of Brasenose, the Warden of New College, perhaps the Warden of All Souls, and of course the venerable President of Magdalene, all of whom are now passed away, held themselves aloof from such counsels. But scarcely one, if one, of the others can be excused: they had warned the young men in their respective colleges against listening to him; they had denounced his doctrines as dangerous; they had condemned him for something, they did not venture to say what; they had gone the length of suspending him from preaching before the University; they had driven his friends from the University and from the Church. This was the man who stood

forth as their protector in their hour of danger. Unmoved by the indignities which they had poured on him, Dr. Pusey pleaded and argued for them with a power which no other man in the University could exercise, and if he could do nothing else for them he at least broke their fall. We should be glad to know if the Warden of Wadham and the President of S. John's felt a glow of shame when they found his protecting shield thrown over them.

But the most important part of his evidence was not on the constitution of the Hebdomadal Council, but on the comparative merits of Professorial teaching, and Collegiate teaching and training. On this subject Mr. Henry Halford Vaughan had contributed evidence to the Royal Commissioners, couched in such strikingly metaphorical language as to have caused merriment throughout the University. Mr. Vaughan was at that time Regius Professor of Modern History, and he was not remarkable for the excellence or for the number of his lectures. Generally, indeed, he appeared in the summer term, when the University was well supplied with ladies, and gave in the theatre a series of lectures, which, for grandiose language, emptiness, and even less desirable qualities, have seldom been equalled, at least in Oxford. Once the University was obliged to pass a special statute exempting undergraduates from the necessity of attending two courses of professors' lectures before their examination in the schools, because Mr. Vaughan did not lecture. The purport of this gentleman's evidence was, that Tutors were wretched inventions, which it would be better to do away with as soon as possible, and that Professorships ought to be established for the instruction of the academical youth. These Professorships were to be well endowed, but at the same time no conditions with respect to lecturing were to be enforced on the Professors,—that would be cramping genius. In all probability they would lecture, and, if they did not, they would still serve the purpose of some curious water-engine, whose functions were dimly shadowed out, cleansing and purifying the cities of the earth, while the drops which unconsciously fell from them would give sufficient refreshment to the soil around them. Mr. Vaughan's views were, to a considerable degree, adopted by the Commissioners. Dr. Pusey drew upon the store of his enormous erudition, and of his own experience as a student at a German University, to prove the great superiority (when only one of the two was to be had) of Collegiate to Professorial teaching. This elicited a pamphlet from Mr. Vaughan, written in his usual arrogant style, which met with a crushing reply from Dr. Pusey, in his '*Professorial and Collegiate Teaching.*'

But a mightier power than argument was bringing the aca-

demic debates to a conclusion. Mr. Gladstone, Lord Palmerston, and Lord John Russell, brought in a Bill for the purpose of carrying out, so far as they thought fit, the suggestions of the Royal Commissioners. No doubt the University owes much to Mr. Gladstone—how much it cannot tell—for preventing the admission of what might, but for him, have found its way into the Bill. His courtesy and considerateness in weighing and replying to the suggestions made to him by any of his constituents who thought fit to write to him, won him the affection of many. Sir William Heathcote and Mr. Roundell Palmer earned the gratitude of the University by their endeavours, sometimes successful, sometimes unsuccessful, in her behalf. The Bill met with much opposition, and it was only by the singular and indomitable perseverance of Mr. Gladstone that it was pushed through in a shorn condition at last. At the very latest moment a clause was tacked to it, opposed by the Ministry in the Commons but accepted in the Lords, requiring the admission of Dissenters to the University. In the House of Lords, Lord Canning took charge of it, and delivered a speech which showed that though a First-class-man himself, he knew very little about the University and its needs. Indeed, the only two Peers who seemed to be at all conversant with the details of the subject on which the House was legislating, were Lord Derby and the Bishop of Oxford. The latter gave a 'grudging' but yet an active support to the Bill. The former had his hands tied by his previous enunciation of liberal sentiments as to the admission of Dissenters: nor has Oxford yet forgotten that her Chancellor—the leader, and if he chooses the controller, of the House of Lords—allowed the Bill to pass through the House with a hasty debate and an illusory opposition, because the Liverpool races were expecting his noble presence. The Bill became law, and the Commissioners for carrying out its provisions with respect to the Colleges were appointed. Here again, we do not know how much the University may not owe to the influence of Mr. Gladstone as to the *personnel* of the Commission, which was on the whole fair and equitable. This Commission in due time brought its work to a conclusion (except in regard to S. John's College), and we see the results of the whole movement in the present state of Oxford. We may now ask what is the good and what is the evil which has been effected?

Among the good things which have been wrought, we may first name the breaking down of the hebdomadal oligarchy and the institution of Congregation. Secondly, the abolition of local restrictions, and the revising of certain trusts, which, though objections may be easily raised, appear to us both justifiable and expedient. Thirdly, the abolition of certain oaths, which seem, though without good reason, to have been a snare to some

consciences. Fourthly, a general life which was imparted to the University, not by any specific enactments, but by the very stirring of University questions. We are unable to see any other advantages which have resulted from the University Reform Bill.

The evils are more patent. First, the theoretical position of the University is very different from that which it held before. What has been thoroughly remodelled once may be more thoroughly remodelled a second time with less offence to general sentiment, and even to justice. When Founders' wills have been put aside, not only in their accidents but in their essential provisions, it will be difficult hereafter to appeal to Founders' wills. When 'some portion of the revenues of colleges has been taken away with the conqueror's hands (I admit it is small, but it is the act of a conqueror, nevertheless,) to swell 'the pomp of the University' (*Chase*, p. 13), it is strange if the *væ victis* argument is not some day pressed further. When Nonconformist undergraduates have been recognised as existing by Parliamentary right, it is less easy (though, no doubt, possible and right) to argue against the existence of Nonconformist graduates.

But we pass from theoretical difficulties to practical evils. Formerly, fellowships were given to those persons for whom fellowships were founded, that is, for those who were, or who were about to be, ordained. Now they are to a great extent tenable by laymen. Formerly, they were held by poor men, or at least by men who made a profession of limited means by the very fact of holding them. The claims of poverty have now been ignored. Formerly, fellows were bound to reside, unless they received special permission from their college dispensing with their residence. Now, residence is not one of the qualifications for holding fellowships. Formerly, fellowships were regarded as implying some duties and sentiments—duties towards brother-fellows and scholars, sentiments of affection and gratitude towards founders. Now, they have become 'college emoluments' gained as prizes, and involving no duties to any one. These contrasts take but a few lines for their expression, but the distinction effected by them between fellowships as they were and fellowships as they are, is world-wide. Mark each one of them.

A certain proportion, and in many colleges a very large proportion, of fellows *must* now be laymen. We pass by the fact that Colleges were founded specially for the education of secular clergy in distinction from regulars, and that, consequently, the primary purposes of Founders in establishing them have been violated. We ask what will be the practical result? As yet the enactment has not had time to bring forth its fruits, but it

will do so surely, and is beginning to do so already. The first apparent effect will be, that the junior fellows in each College will be unsettled as to their profession. On the one hand, there will be the temptation of a tutorship, which with the fellowship would produce some 500*l.* or 600*l.* a year, but would offer no prospect beyond itself—nothing on which to rest after labour or to settle upon in life. On the other side, there will be allurements offered by the Bar, the medical profession, the public office, the Horse Guards, or (why not?) the hunting box. Suppose they take the former alternative, then the character of Oxford education will greatly change; for, whatever may be said to the contrary, the only way of securing a Churchman's education is that of placing education mainly in the hands of the clergy of the Church. Suppose they choose the latter course, then the whole of the emoluments which they draw from the University will be subtracted from the support of education and religion, which the University and Colleges were specially founded to encourage. Nor was there any just cause for the change on the grounds of scandal produced by the present system. If we were to take the same number of clergymen in Oxford and in the country, we are bold to say that among the former would be found fewer who had entered Holy Orders improperly, and were a disgrace to their profession, than among the latter.

Then, with regard to poverty. On this point Mr. Chase and Mr. Neate fought a brave but an unsuccessful battle. 'We have seen,' says the former in the pamphlet before us, 'poverty and struggling merit pushed to the wall, and the advantages of wealth at last admitted to that preponderance here, which elsewhere, in our commercial nation, they had long enjoyed.' And yet, with what probable result, except to increase non-residence?

'The pretext for the innovation is, that since the Colleges have become the educational bodies in the Universities, all other considerations should give way to the paramount necessity of providing the ablest instructors. But is it at all probable that when the fellowships have been bestowed on able and brilliant men, who are in easy circumstances, their services will be available for the work of instruction? . . . We must face the facts of the case. Putting aside those few places of educational employment, the high position and large emoluments of which amply account for the readiness with which they are filled, do we find that men in easy circumstances usually give themselves up to the work of education? And if they have not hitherto done so, why are we to take it for granted that they will do it in future?

'An able young man of two or three-and-twenty, with independent means, will never undertake the drudgery of instruction. Some few may turn from more ambitious employments to the learned leisure of academical life; but they will prefer to educate themselves, and so cultivate their own powers, and follow their own pursuits. The *deliciae* of instruction they may condescend to; but, if experience may be trusted, we must look for academical instruction to the ranks of those who, obliged to work for their livelihood, find a satisfaction in directing their energies into this channel.'—*Chase*, p. 9.



And next, as to residence. Before now, it is true that some have not resided; but there has been no right of non-residence, and generally, when non-resident, men have been employed as school-masters (so preparing themselves for Tutorships) or as curates. In either case, they were advancing education and religion, and could be summoned to the College, if needed. The young barrister is not specially promoting education or religion, and it is utterly impossible to summon him into residence without ruining the whole prospects of his life. It will never be done.

And lastly, what a difference between a fellow as he was and the holder of a 'College emolument!' There was an old fashion of President, Fellows, and Scholars meeting yearly, and reading over together the statutes which their Founder laid down for the regulation of his College. Generally, at the end of the statutes, was found an address, wherein the Founder earnestly besought those who subsisted upon his bounty to look on themselves as one family, to live with one another as brethren, and to do their duty one to another. The tie was felt; the younger felt themselves drawn nearer to the elder,—the teacher to the taught; they were all members of their Founder's family, and to him they bore a common feeling of gratitude. We trust and believe, that by force of *genius loci*, and old traditions, this feeling will continue still. For 'the unity of the college has been,' on Mr. Goldwin Smith's testimony, 'a strong band, not only of affectionate association, but of duty,' which 'it is hard to break through.'—P. 39. But so far as the Reform bill goes, it has been swept away ruthlessly. A fellow having gained his 'College emolument' by his bow and his spear, enjoys it of right, as a reward for past exertion. The successful student who has won the Hertford or the Ireland Scholarship, owes thereby thanks to none and duties to none. So far as the Bill has been able to effect it, the gainer of a fellowship has been put in the same position of cold independence.

We say, then, that the abolition of each one of these things, the 'Clerical restriction,' Poverty, Residence, and Collegiate duties, is in itself a great evil; but the abolition of them all at once intensifies the evil more than fourfold:—

'You forget the Reform for which you either clamoured, or over which you chuckled or allowed yourself to go to sleep. Allow me to inform you, that fellowships have been stripped of every vestige of their eleemosynary character—that they no longer bind to residence—that they may be enjoyed (to the exclusion of your own sons, who need them) by men whose fathers should be ashamed to benefit by them—that, in consequence, you may expect they will be used by their holders as a useful help in their professional life in London, and will not unfrequently supply better lodgings, a horse for the park, longer and pleasanter continental tours than before, to some of those fortunate youths who draw ample supplies already, either from the paternal purse, or, by favour of

the powers that rule in Downing-street, from the bottomless purse of the nation. The plea on which the rights of *indigentes* were sacrificed was that you would get abler men to hold College Tutorships. That plea unfortunately answered its immediate purpose, and it has done its work; but I confidently anticipate that the "abler men" who are to carry off our fellowships will more than ever be tempted away from their Colleges and from the University to try their fortune in the world outside, and will consider their duty done when they have acknowledged the receipt of the Bursar's cheque.—*Chase*, p. 7.

'It is my belief that the late changes are so far from being likely to improve the means at our command as even probably to make these means less efficacious than they have been. A premium has been given on going away, and we have not the power to outbid by a premium on remaining.'—*Ibid*, p. 9.

We have not named among the advantages of the reform the increased life and power with which the Professoriate has been inspired. We have deliberately not done so. The Professor-cry was a folly, but it was successful. It was set afloat by the original University Commission, who made the Professors their pets, because they are University as distinct from Collegiate teachers, because many of them are nominated by the Prime Minister, or by some body external to Oxford, and because, always accepting the theological Professors, the subject of their studies necessarily puts them, more than others, outside the flow of ordinary academic thought and feeling. Now, when the cry has done its work, we are told that 'the modern press is 'the mediæval Professor; and it is absurd to think that in these 'days of universal mental activity, and universal publication, 'men can be elected or appointed by Convocation or by the 'Crown, to head the march of thought, and give the world new 'truth; and that 'the Professor is henceforth the colleague of 'the Tutor in the duties of university education' (*Prof. Smith*, p. 40). This is good sense, but it was the idea that is now pooh-poohed, which was strong enough to carry through the scheme of laying hands on Collegiate property in order to endow the Professoriate. In matter of fact, so far as Professorial *work* goes, no appreciable difference has been wrought by the Bill. It is slightly increased, and slightly better, but not much. The real work of education in its main branches is done, as we trust it will always be done, by the College Tutors, while the Professor adds some ornamental touches:—

"'Happily," writes Captain Burrows, "these controversies on the respective merits of the Professorial and Tutorial systems which divided the University some time ago, have left it, for all practical purposes, pretty near where it was before they began; it is sufficient for the reader that both systems are working on side by side, and we have only to inquire how best to combine them. The proper adjustment seems to be simply this:—The Professor's lectures must be considered as *supplementary* to the College Tutor's, and by no means a substitute for them."—*Pass and Class*, p. 54.

That which the University Reform Bill did well, it might have done better. As we have said, the chief good effected by it is the alteration of the constitution of the Hebdomadal Board.

But this alteration has not been effected in the way which would answer best to the interests of the University. Professor Smith feels confident that 'jealousies between Professors and Tutors, which were never very rational, may now surely be 'numbered with the past' (p. 40). We hope so likewise. But the constitution of the Hebdomadal Council seems to be expressly framed for the purpose of keeping alive a distinct and separate feeling in the Professors and in the rest of the Masters. There is no conceivable reason for one-third of the Council consisting of Professors as such. Had the election of the members of the Council been left free to the Masters (with, perhaps, a certain reserve in favour of the Heads of Houses for old tradition's sake), there would have been an equal number of Professors chosen as there are at present; indeed, we feel sure that almost every Professor now sitting in the Council would still be there; but then they would not have sat *as* Professors, but as the delegates of the Masters; and that would have been likely to have made no little difference in their feeling towards the bulk of the University, and in the feeling of the bulk of the University towards them. But Oxford cannot complain of the framers of the Bill on this score. Even the Tutors' Association recommended, as an alternative plan to a much better scheme, the creation of the three-bodied board. It is to the Bishop of Oxford, if we recollect right, that thanks are due for having carried an amendment, vesting the election of the Heads of Houses, Professors and Masters who constitute the Council, in the members of Convocation; whereas, according to the original proposal, the Heads of Houses were to have been elected by the Heads of Houses, the Professors by the Professors, and the Masters by the Masters, which would have effectually prevented the Council from enjoying the confidence of the University.

On the whole, we may say that the Constitutional changes effected by the University Reform Bill have done some little good, some present harm, and very serious prospective evil, and that the best interests of the University would have been better served by a short Bill altering the constitution of the Hebdomadal Board, giving the board so constituted a power of revising certain trusts within a limited period, abolishing local restrictions, and either forbidding certain oaths, or adding to them an explanatory clause. But whether such a measure as that which we have sketched in the last sentence would have satisfied the House of Commons after the publication of the Royal Commissioners' Report, is perhaps doubtful. That both her burgesses strove to effect in Parliament, and out of Parliament, what they were convinced was the best that could in difficult circumstances be effected for the welfare of the University, we do not doubt.

III. We now proceed to the Educational Movement, on which the publications which we have placed at the head of the present article have a more direct bearing. The two that stand first we cannot be wrong in attributing to the same author, although the first is published anonymously, for the same principles pervade both, and there are passages in 'Pass and Class' which are expansions of passages in 'Educational Reform.' The preface of 'Pass and Class' ends as follows:—'If those who have been trained up from their youth on the knees of Alma Mater, can forgive the presumption of the undertaking, they will perhaps make allowance for any errors which may have been committed in details, by one who, before his seven years' apprenticeship at the University, received his own training under a nurse much more resembling the "Sabine Mother" of the poet' (p. viii). This allusion to himself gives us a right, which we should not otherwise have, of inquiring into the antecedents of the writer. The modesty displayed in the sentence which we have quoted is not misplaced, for modesty is never misplaced; but, if we mistake not, our readers will see that no one could be better situated for forming a clear and dispassionate judgment as to the state of University education and its merits than Mr. Montagu Burrows. The 'Sabine Mother,' to whom he refers, is the Royal Navy. His boyhood and early youth—all that period which is generally devoted to Greek and Latin, and to the studies of the University—were spent on board ship, where he rose by successive steps to the post of Commander. During this time his physical training was perfect of its kind, and his powers of observation were quickened and drawn out by that experience of 'the manners of many men and their cities' which is one essential part of education. Nor were the advantages of the 'Sabine' training lost. But still Captain Burrows felt, what most men would not have felt, that there was a want of systematic intellectual training to make him the fully-developed man that, with the powers that God had given him, he might become. Accordingly, as soon as he found himself ashore, he determined to spend such time as he might have before he was again called into active service, in the cultivation of his mental powers. The best place for carrying out his purpose he judged to be Oxford—where his brothers, we may add, had already distinguished themselves. He matriculated, and set himself to work diligently and faithfully upon the studies of the place. Of course, a Commander R.N. could not have that familiarity with the niceties of Greek and Latin composition which a young man coming straight from the public schools would have; but he had, instead, the firm and strong purpose which the discipline of his Sabine nurse had taught him, and the vigour and determination of a man's will. These qualities made

the balance more than even. Science, history, and scholarship were alike mastered, and at the end of three years, Captain Burrows was found to make one of a small first-class in the classical schools. He was not yet satisfied. For the next half-year he devoted himself to the study of law and modern history, and at the end of that time he obtained the honour of a first-class here likewise; a 'better first,' it was currently reported, than had ever been achieved in these schools, with the sole exception of that won by the Marquis of Lothian a year or two previously. Captain Burrows is the first Commander R.N. who has ever gained the honour of an Oxford double first-class, as Lord Lothian is the first Marquis, and we believe the first actual Peer who has obtained the same honour. The position which such a man must hold is singularly good for judging of the merits of the Oxford system in general, as well as for acting as a guide to others through the country which he has himself traversed. Coming to the University with a man's matured mind, he is able to grasp the system in all its bearings, and he is able to look inwards upon himself and mark the effect of the course on his own mind, in a way which a boy cannot do who has just arrived from school, and who has not yet learned the art of speculating on himself as though he were an external object. Whatever, therefore, may be Captain Burrows' conclusions, we may be sure that they will be well worth consideration.

What the system of education in Oxford was before the commencement of the present century, we do not presume to guess. Certainly, some well-educated men came forth from the University, but we suspect that the educational system had little to do with it. But in the year 1802 the class system was introduced; and it continued, with slight modifications, down to the year 1850. Half a century is as long a time as any system of examinations can be expected to remain unchanged, even when it is as good as the 'old system' undoubtedly was. It was based solely on Classics and Mathematics; and Mathematics were as subordinate to Classics at Oxford, as Classics to Mathematics in Cambridge. Each student passed two examinations, one, called by the gods, Responsions, but by mortals, Little-go, the other, known as the Public Examination, or Great-go. For men ambitious of double honours, the latter examination was divided into the classical and the mathematical schools, but no Mathematics were *required* of a man who took honours in Classics. It was under this system that the following statesmen obtained the highest honours,—Sir Robert Peel, Sir Richard Bethell, Lord Harrowby, Sir William Heathcote, Lord

Shaftesbury, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Frederick Rogers, Lord Canning, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Cardwell, Lord Carnarvon; and the following Bishops,—the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Chichester, St. Asaph, Hereford, Oxford, Gloucester and Bristol, Salisbury, Lincoln, London, Carlisle.

In 1850, the claims of Physics, Law, and Modern History, were recognised by the University as competing with Classics and Mathematics for the right of being regarded as instruments of education. But were they all to be placed upon an equality, or were the new subjects to be admitted in subordination to the old? It was determined that the essential character of the educational course was to be Classical, but that it was to be supplemented in each case by Mathematics, or by Physics, or by Law and Modern History, (which were thrown together so as to constitute one subject,) according to the taste of each individual. Accordingly four final schools were constituted; the Classical school, to be passed by all, and the Mathematical school, the Physical school, the Law and Modern History schools, one of which was to be passed by each. At the same time the examinations were remodelled, and were now increased to four: 1. Responsions, or Little-go; 2. Moderations; 3. Final Classical School; 4. Final Mathematical (or, perhaps, Physical or Historical) School. This was the system which the present Vice-Chancellor, then a junior Head of a House, carried through the Hebdomadal Board and Convocation. We shudder at the thought of the labour which he must have undergone in doing so; but his success was creditable both to his own assiduity and to the Hebdomadal councillors. The change effected was enormous, and might well have roused prejudice against it; but the Board was not obstructive, and it was accepted by the Masters. This system is at work still. But it was not to be expected that it would be free from assault. It is of the nature of a compromise. Classics yielded so far as to admit not only Mathematics but Physics and Modern History into the curriculum. Therefore the ultra-classicists were opposed to it. But Classics did not yield up the supreme place, or grant her young brothers and sisters an equality with herself. Therefore the 'advanced' party was discontented with it. Twice have efforts been made to overthrow it,—once in 1857, and again in 1859. Each time the object was to dethrone Classics more completely; but these efforts were so far from being successful, that the last attempt resulted in a reaction which nearly succeeded in reinstating something very like the old system, such as it was before 1850.

It was on the last of these occasions that Captain Burrows published his 'Educational Reform.' He states 'the principles



which the present system was intended to express' as follows:—

'1. To insure in the case of every member of the University a knowledge of the ordinary elements of a gentleman's education, grammar, arithmetic, &c., as a condition of proceeding to the proper work of the place.

'2. To make the main study of the University a uniform training in language (taking the Latin and Greek as the most highly developed, and enshrining the best masterpieces), logic, philosophy, and ancient history; at the same time requiring a certain elementary knowledge of divinity, as a necessary accompaniment to the *Literæ Humaniores*.

'3. To append to this, the principal object of the course, an examination which should enforce an acquaintance with at least the elements of some one out of three other subjects: subjects which might be either useful as subsidiary species of mental training, or introductory to some professional career.'—*Educational Reform*, p. 5.

These principles he accepts as the legitimate principle on which the University ought to base her educational system:—

'They will not be impugned by those who regard Oxford as a place for the general training of the mind, rather than for a direct commencement of the pursuits of after life; assured as they are that any future work will be of a far higher order if grounded on such a foundation. They will not be thrown aside as old-fashioned by those who have watched with hearty satisfaction the revival at Oxford, in a form suited to the requirements of the age, of those truly liberal studies for which she was once so famous, and which she almost alone in their general decay kept alive; who have along with that revival cheerfully accepted those further changes which the circumstances of the times invited, and have admitted, but only to a secondary place in the course, along with and on the same footing as Mathematics, the subjects of Natural Science, of Law and Modern History. No essential departure from these principles will be tolerated by those who are resolved that Oxford shall not descend from the leading position which has hitherto, with all her shortcomings, been generally assigned to her.'—P. 6.

But although Captain Burrows, and, as it turned out, the majority of Convocation, 'accepted these general principles as those which should guide the University,' there was a section, both in and out of the Council, which was by no means satisfied with Mathematics, Natural Science, Law, and Modern History being 'appended' and 'subsidiary' to training in scholarship, logic, philosophy, and ancient history. They accordingly proposed an *optional school scheme*, that is, a plan which allowed the student to pass his final examination either in Classics, or in Mathematics, or in Physics, or in Law and Modern History, as he pleased, without necessarily passing through a final Classical school. On this point Captain Burrows writes:—

'The Classics under this plan would no longer form the main element in Oxford education. An entire revolution would have taken place. The great majority of pass-men would consider one question only,—Which examination is the easiest?—and they are not likely to prefer Latin and Greek to English. An Oxford degree would be more generally taken in Natural Science, in Law

and Modern History, or even Mathematics, than in Classics. The training of the last year of the course, which is more valuable than that of the other two put together, would thus cease to be given by those studies which, it has been assumed, are the best for that purpose. The non-classical schools, being final, and the *sole* final schools, would give their colouring to the whole career of each man; the previous Classical work, finished and thrown aside at Moderations, would be looked on as only a hindrance to the other, with which it would have no visible connexion, and far less interest would be taken in it than even at present.

Nor would the effect be confined to the pass-school. It would be similar in kind, though not in degree, in the class-schools. The fellowships at Colleges would of course influence the latter to a considerable extent, and at present the great majority of these being given away for Classics, that school would for a time attract the greatest numbers; but it can hardly be doubted that such a premium on the Classical school would be of a very precarious nature when the change now under consideration had had time to make itself generally felt. As a matter of course the fellowships would gradually follow the change in the University studies, and those given for Classics would diminish in number till they amounted to no more than a proportion corresponding to the extent to which those studies were pursued.—P. 13.

#### One more passage:—

‘The Oxford course has certainly proved itself inferior to no other in producing that well-balanced character, religiously, morally, and intellectually,—that richness of mental culture, that capacity for the highest attainments, which are the true objects of education. Without making invidious comparisons with any other institution, one has only to take the hastiest glance at any of the higher departments of society, in order to find abundant evidence of her success. Whether we look at our statesmen, our divines, our men of letters, our more cultivated gentry, our upper schoolmasters, we shall find no lack of Oxford men in their highest ranks. While, then, it may well be hoped that under present arrangements we may see Oxford take a more effective possession of the world of science also, it is just to pause before we do anything to damage the position she has already won.’—P. 49.

The pamphlet, though published anonymously, had considerable effect on thoughtful minds, and several of the speeches in Congregation were avowedly based upon its arguments. The result of discussion was that the *Optionalists* were routed, and the scheme of 1850 confirmed, with a few modifications of detail. Twice the Master of Pembroke has had the satisfaction of seeing his scheme triumphantly vindicated—but it has been against assaults headed by himself. On the second occasion the reaction ran so high, that had it not been for the (liberal) obstructiveness of the Hebdomadal Council, a main feature of the 1850 scheme would have been swept away in favour of the old or 1802 system. A petition to that effect obtained, we believe, the signature of a majority of Congregation.

In the course of this debate Mr. Chase put forth his pamphlets (in place, as he said, of a speech) on the Voluntary System as applied to University Examinations and to University Instruction. We have already quoted passages from them with approval,

but we trust that the Principal of S. Mary Hall will allow us a word of friendly remonstrance. We cannot help most sincerely regretting that a man of his high character and undoubted abilities should so throw away his influence as he does by his love of paradox. His proposal of admitting students to any examination as soon as they brought testimony of having passed their previous examination, is one against which argument preponderates, but yet it is worthy of consideration. But when he coupled with it a proposal of delegating all pass-examination to the Colleges, and of substituting for College Tutors 'any men of good character,' who were to 'form classes' throughout the University, 'the questions of ability and payment settling themselves,' he must have known that he could only hope to raise a smile in his audience. We do not doubt that he relished the propositions himself all the more because he knew that no one else would think with him. But this is not the way to gain for himself that influence in the councils of the University which his great talents and his known integrity of purpose deserve that he should have.

The result of the struggles of 1857 and 1859 being the confirmation, as we have said, of the system of 1850, Captain Burrows has published his 'Pass and Class' as a guide-book through the courses of *Literæ Humaniores*, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Law and Modern History.

'The want of such a work for the use of Oxford Undergraduates has been long avowed. To meet that want is the chief aim of this attempt: but a straightforward description of the education given at the University seemed also desirable for an ulterior purpose. It was thought it might be useful at schools to those preparing for Oxford; to parents, who naturally wish to know what sort of teaching modern Oxford proposes to give their sons; to those of the general public who care to consider the subject either abstractedly or otherwise, and whose ideas, not previously very clear perhaps as to the meaning of the words "University education," have been in a chronic state of mystification ever since the introduction of the "new system" in 1850.'—*Preface*.

It will not be only to these classes that this book will be useful. Does any one who is anxious to educate himself, wish to know how to begin, and what books he is to set to work upon? He will find this little volume invaluable. Is his subject ancient history? He will find his books chosen for him, and the order of his studies laid out, in the fourth chapter. In the tenth chapter he will find the same done for modern history and for law; in the fifth, for moral philosophy and logic; in the eighth, for mathematics; and in the ninth, for natural science. And not only are courses of study prescribed, but the reader is instructed as to the manner in which work must be done in order really to 'get it up,' in the Oxford sense of the word.

To the student therefore, in general, and to the man who desires to become a student, 'Pass and Class' will be useful, but

more particularly to the Oxford undergraduate, for whom it was primarily intended. Too many young men go to the University with a full intention of devoting themselves to their studies, who do not know how to begin, and never grasp the what, and the when, and the where, and the how, of their work. The consequence is, that they flounder through the wrong books, or use the wrong editions, or waste their energies on unimportant questions, and the result at last is failure, in spite of honest work done, and good talents ill-employed. This is especially the case with young men who have been educated at private schools, or by private tutors who have themselves been absent from the University for a considerable length of time. We will add, that there is a reverent tone and religious spirit which run through the book, enhancing its value to the student at all times, but especially in the present state of Oxford thought.

Mr. Tweed was not contented with the vote of 1859, and in the following term (May, 1859) he wrote his 'Two Letters to the Vice-Chancellor on the Examinations,' urging further changes of detail. His letters seem to have fallen dead. The University was weary of legislation, and, like the nation, preferred expending its energies in enrolling and organizing volunteer bands, to debating and carrying doubtful measures of reform. The University was right. No doubt the present system is a compromise, but it is a fair compromise, and it is best to hold by it.

The real point which has been in debate for the last fifteen years in Oxford, has been often overlaid by non-essential questions reading to false issues, and has often narrowed itself to some slight matter of detail utterly incomprehensible to outsiders, such as whether the poets should be brought up at moderation, or at the final examination. But there has ever been a real question at the bottom, and it is this:—Shall Oxford education be (1) classical, (2) general and liberal, (3) tutorial, *i.e.* moral as well as intellectual? or, shall it be (1) non-classical, (2) special and professional, (3) professorial? The first is the programme of the Conservatives, the second of the Radicals. The present system is plainly a compromise between these two views. For (1) Classics, *i.e.* ancient moral philosophy, ancient history, logic founded upon Aristotle, and a critical though not hypercritical knowledge of Greek and Latin, are the main study of the place, but they admit Mathematics, Natural Science, Law, and Modern History, to a seat, not on a level with, but next below themselves. The student (2) continues to be *περὶ πάντων πεπαιδευμένος*, and his education is therefore a liberal education, but still room is made in the second schools for 'subjects which may be introductory to some professional career.' The training (3) is mainly Collegiate and Tutorial, but it is supplemented by Professorial teaching.

We counsel both parties to rest contented with what they have gained, and not to push the struggle à l'outrance. Twice the present *status* has been assailed from the Radical side, but let the assailants recollect that each time they were unsuccessful, and that the second time they provoked a reactionary feeling, which would infallibly have carried all before it had it not been for the interposition of the Hebdomadal Council. Let them reflect that a man may pass through the University with only a smattering of Classics, and yet earn honours in any other subject that he may choose, and that he *may* make his studies almost wholly professional, though the majority of students (we trust) will not. Let them be contented with seeing one-third of the *power* in the University placed in the hands of the Professors, while the *drudgery* is cheerfully undergone by the Tutors.

On the other side the Conservatives have their share of benefits from the compromise. Nor should they forget that there are reasons for their not holding by Classics so stiffly, as from 1800 to 1850, while yet they maintain their supremacy. Training in Classics is the best training that can be had, and the classical models are the best models that can be had. Even Lord Brougham may be brought forward in testimony. His remarkable letter to Mr. Zachary Macaulay, published at the time of the death of Lord Macaulay, will not have escaped our readers' memory. Sir William Hamilton's opinion of the immense superiority of Classics to Mathematics, which 'tend to cultivate only a few of our faculties in a partial and feeble manner,' and to Natural Sciences, which are 'essentially easy, and do not cultivate the mind,' will be found in his 'Discussions,' as well as M. Cousin's declaration, that 'classical studies maintain the several traditions of the intellectual and moral life of our humanity,' and that 'to enfeeble them would be an act of barbarism, an attempt against true civilization, and in a certain sense the crime of lese-humanity.' We accept the pre-eminent value of Classics as an undoubted fact. But we desire to offer one caution and two observations respecting them. Our caution is that Classics are not to be confounded with philology. Philology is as much a *specialty* as osteology, or numismatology, and is to be condemned as confidently when under the disguise of scholarship it encroaches beyond its limits. To use the words of Mr. Tweed and Mr. Linwood, both of them excellent scholars:—

'The English gentleman, the future barrister, physician, theologian, senator, will certainly not be content to wear away even the whole of his academical life in the study of words and phrases. "There are two kinds of knowledge," says Erasmus, "*Verborum prior, rerum potior*;" and the Oxford man must be encouraged to proceed from the former to the latter, by an examination, making scholarship subservient to the illustration of history, of poetry, and oratory, and lastly of philosophy itself, if we hope to engage and to retain the

interest of the class which probably will always furnish by far the largest number of our students. . . . We must not, so far as we can help it, allow the Oxford scholar to be less of the *τεπλ πᾶν πεναυδευμένος* than he is at present. . . . Let philology be recognised as a *specialty*, in which distinguished proficiency is to be rewarded; but not as an essential and indispensable qualification for the first class. In an examination system like ours, the popular use of scholarship "for the speedy and perfect attaining languages, for understanding of authors," is more to be regarded than the *special* objects pursued by those who are charged with the duty of advancing philological science.'—*Tweed*, p. 19.

And similarly Mr. Goldwin Smith:—

'A classical education meant then, not a gymnastic exercise of the mind in philology, but a deep draught from what was the great, and almost the only spring of philosophy, science, history, and poetry, at that time. It is not to philological exercise that our earliest Latin grammar exhorts the student, nor is it a mere sharpening of the faculties that it promises as his reward. It calls to the study of the language wherein is contained a great treasure of wisdom and knowledge; and, the student's labour done, wisdom and knowledge were to be his meed. It was to open that treasure, not for the sake of philological niceties or beauties, not to shine as the inventor of a canon or the emendator of a corrupt passage, that the early scholars undertook those ardent, life-long, and truly romantic toils which their massy volumes bespeak to our days—our days which are not degenerate from theirs in labour, but in which the most ardent intellectual labour is directed to a new prize.'—*Smith*, p. 20.

If 'Classics' were to be confounded with this 'gymnastic exercise' in the Greek and Latin language, there would be no defence for them. By the term 'Classics' is meant ancient literature in its purest types, more particularly comprehending the philosophy, history, and poetry of Greece and Rome, illustrated by the works of modern philosophers, historians, and poets; and it is quite true, as Mr. Tweed warns us, that while avoiding other specialties, it is necessary to guard against the specialty of Greek and Latin hypercritical scholarship.

Next, it cannot be denied that some advantages which belonged to Classics have been diminished, though not destroyed, in the course of the last fifty years. Formerly, the grand old writers of antiquity were left to say for themselves what they had to say, but now they are treated much as the Fathers are treated by the Church of Rome. They are *interpreted* by a modern authority. And unhappily, by a great error of judgment on the part of Examiners, these interpretations are required even more rigorously than the author's sentiments or statements. Under this system even Aristotle and Plato are not allowed to lay down the principles of morals and metaphysics without having modern theories attributed to them which they never dreamed of. But more particularly is this true with respect to history. Under the manipulation of Niebuhr, Arnold, and Dean Liddell, the aristocratic Livy has been made to teach democracy, while Mr. Grote has turned the genial stories of Herodotus and the grave unbiassed wisdom of Thucydides into vehicles for philosophic Radicalism.



"Ancient historians," says Professor Smith, "have, or seem to have, this advantage over the modern as instruments of education. They are removed in time from the party feelings of the present day. They might be expected to be as far from our passions as they are, considering the wide interval of ages, marvellously near to our hearts. And, undoubtedly, they are farther from our passions than the historians of the present day. Yet even to those serene and lofty peaks of the old world, political prejudice has found its way. The last great History of Greece is at once a most admirable history and a pamphlet which some may think less admirable in favour of universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and mob courts of law."—P. 24.

These are words worthy of serious consideration. According to Professor Goldwin Smith's testimony, Mr. Grote's History of Greece is a *political pamphlet in favour of universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and mob courts of law*. And yet this is the book which every young man who goes up for a class must, as the examinations are at present conducted, not only read, but study so diligently as to saturate his mind with it. Captain Burrows is plainly aware of Mr. Grote's faults and deficiencies. He speaks of his History as 'being wanting in that spirit of fairness and moderation which distinguish Bishop Thirlwall's' (p. 73), and warns the student against being misled by his views 'on the 'primitive legends, on the democratic character of many events 'of which he treats, and on the character of the Sophists' (p. 106); and he significantly adds: 'The more faithfully 'Thucydides' own spirit is caught by the particular mind 'brought to bear impartially on the text, and the less attention 'that is paid to the colouring which is put upon him by others, 'the better.' (*Ibid.*) Yet Captain Burrows recommends Mr. Grote as the scholar's guide. And he could not do otherwise, while Examiners examine in Grote instead of, as they ought, in Herodotus and Thucydides. We think, indeed, that Captain Burrows overrates the value of 'Mr. Grote's critical treatment of the text of Herodotus and Thucydides' (p. 73). Mr. Shilleto's pamphlet, 'Thucydides or Grote?' was no doubt written in a more off-hand and contemptuous manner than the subject of his criticism deserved, but he has proved Mr. Grote—Mr. Grote proves himself in every page of his history—a very bad scholar. Whenever he does find his way through a difficult passage which has puzzled previous commentators, it is by his historical instinct, not by his critical acumen that he is led right. We cannot pause to point out his many mistakes, sometimes of a word, as when he says that Timocrates 'fell overboard into the harbour of Naupactus' (vol. vi. p. 283), which would have been a hard feat as his ship was not in the harbour, instead of 'that 'his body was washed into the harbour and thrown up there:' ἐξέπεσεν ἐς τὸν Ναυπακτίων λιμένα (Thucyd. ii. 92); sometimes of a construction, as in his rendering of Thucyd. ii. 60: 'Καὶ τοὶ ἐμοὶ τοιοῦτῳ ἀνδρὶ ὀργίζεσθε' δὲ οὐδενὸς οἶομαι ἥσσω γινῶναι τε καὶ ἐρμηνεύσαι ταῦτα φιλόπολις τε καὶ χρημάτων κρείστων,

'Ye are now angry both with me, who advised you to go to war, and with yourselves, who followed the advice. Ye listened to me, *considering me* superior to others in judgment, in speech, in patriotism, and in incorruptible patriotism' (vol. vi. p. 223). Nor can we stay even to refer to his many political sophisms. Mr. Goldwin Smith's words are not a whit too severe. Mr. Grote's History is a pamphlet written to suit and to bolster up certain preconceived notions, and the method which he adopts is to misrepresent everything Spartan when conflicting with anything Athenian, and everything done by the Conservative party at Athens, when brought into comparison with the exploits of Cleon and the mob. Nor is Mr. Grote the only culprit. In reading the first decade of Livy we are no longer reading the History of Livy, but an imaginary account of an imaginary people, which being 'an expansion of a subjective consciousness' on the part of Niebuhr, has been dressed up in a spirited and genial way by Dr. Arnold, and more dryly by Dean Liddell. It would surely be a great improvement if Examiners would encourage the second decade of Livy, which does contain acknowledged history, though, it is true, not of a political character, in place of the first, with respect to a great part of which Sir George Cornewall Lewis has proved, that if it contains any history at all, it is impossible for us to know what that history is.

We say then that the value of the study of ancient history has been considerably diminished by the glosses of modern historians on history as written by the ancients. The same may be said in a less degree of moral science and of logic, though Mr. Mansel's *Prolegomena Logica* has done something towards correcting the evils resulting from a too confiding study of Mr. Mill, and we trust that Sir William Hamilton's volume, lately published, will do more.

Our other observation is that from the progress of modern literature, and the general spread of information, it would be neither wise nor safe to ignore 'modern things,' as compared with ancient. The 'younger' studies have a position of their own, and that position is fairly assigned to them at present; and where they are, they are most advantageous.

On the whole, then, we repeat—Let the compromise stand.

It is likely that it will be again assailed. Professor Goldwin Smith (after the manner of Professors who have special interest in the supplemental studies of the University) is anxious for alterations in the Law and Modern History school, and he has published his inaugural lecture, with the view of bringing such alterations 'under the consideration of the Council' (p. 35), and of 'drawing the attention of the University to the state of the school' (p. 38). Dean Liddell, who is supposed to be much under the influence of the Regius Professor of Medicine, has

vaguely pledged himself to do something more for the Physical school.<sup>1</sup> It is natural for active-minded Professors to try to make the study which they represent a more substantial part of the studies of the University. Consequently they are seldom at rest, and here is a reason why that 'jealousy,' to which Professor Smith refers, is not so 'irrational' as he would have us regard it to be.

There is one improvement which we do earnestly desire to see carried out in the University, but it would be by way of addition, not of alteration. Something must be done for the study of theology. True, there are difficulties and objections in the way—objections which sensitive and religious minds will be the first to feel. But we say that something *must* be done. What is the state of theology in Oxford at present? There are four Theological Professors, Canons of Christ Church, each of them excellent men, and representing, singularly enough, the four chief schools of religious thought in the Church of England, each of the four being, perhaps, the best specimen of his school that could be found in the whole of England. There are also the Ireland Exegetical Professor, who is Provost of Oriel, and the Laudian Professor of Arabic, who is Principal of Magdalen Hall. The two last are doubtless greatly engaged with the business of their College and Hall, and with the affairs of the University, as they are also members of the Hebdomadal Council. We may, however, consider these six men to be engaged in the prosecution and advancement of theology, and to them we must add the name of the Rev. W. J. Burgon, the products of whose pen show him to be a theological student, and a promoter of the study of theology, and the highly respected Principal of S. Edmund's Hall. With the exception of these eight men, we believe that there is not a single man in Oxford, among graduates or undergraduates, who systematically studies or promotes the study of theology. Professor Hussey—no alarmist, no utterer of unconsidered and exaggerated words, but a grave, wise, thoughtful, reverent-minded man—in the last sermon which he preached before the University, solemnly warned his hearers that the study of theology was dying out. So long ago as at the time of his installation, Lord Derby urged that something should be done for theology. Nothing has been done, and meantime the 'mediaeval and clerical colleges have been adapted to the purposes of modern and lay education'

<sup>1</sup> The bad taste of Lord Wrottesley, in mixing himself up in the internal struggles of the University, when he was invited to preside over the British Association in Oxford, was excused on the score of his ignorance of the delicacy of the ground on which he was treading. The speech of the Dean of Christ Church, when in moving a vote of thanks to Lord Wrottesley he commented upon his previous remarks, was by so much in worse taste, as it could not be excused on the score of ignorance.

(*Smith*, p. 39), so that the evil has been increasing. There are regulations for a theological examination laid down in a statute-book of the University, but there are no examinees, and the statute is a dead letter. An attempt was made a year and a half ago to turn the Johnson theological scholarship into a reality, by making it an annual object of competition, and remoulding it in certain particulars. It failed, because members of the Hebdomadal Council would not consent to expend so much as 100*l.* on such a scheme, while they were pouring out thousands and tens of thousands to be used or wasted on the Physical Professors' palaces in the parks. In the course of the present year an effort has been made to institute a theological school. It failed—whether rightly or wrongly, we do not say—but this we say, that if the Council could devise, and Convocation accept, some unobjectionable plan, whereby young men, whether after their B.A. degree, or after their final Classical examination, would receive a real training in the study of such books as Pearson and Hooker, S. Augustine and S. Chrysostom, Eusebius and Bede, a great good would be effected. We are disposed to think that young men—particularly if they are going into Holy Orders, and like too many are *not* going to a Theological College—would find such a training more useful than attendance at two sets of lectures from the Divinity Professors, or even than a slight acquaintance with a certain number of curious physical phenomena, or a few events which occurred in England between 1066 and 1509.

\* \* We have not spoken of the middle-class examination, because our subject has been rather the examinations of Oxford than those conducted by Oxford. But we cannot refrain from expressing an earnest hope that before next long vacation the Delegacy will have altered its regulations with respect to that part of the examination which has to do with the rudiments of faith and religion. The uncertainty of men's minds at the time at which the statute was passed, with regard to the religious *status* of Oxford herself, and the haste with which the promoters—Mr. Chase says, dictators—of the scheme hurried the statute through the Council, and Congregation, and Convocation, may be an excuse for the arrangement, as at first made. But there is no excuse for its continuance. Religious knowledge is ignored in a way which Sir James Kay Shuttleworth did not venture to propose. It is more than ignored, it is discouraged; and the practical result is each year in this respect less and less satisfactory. We call the special attention of the delegates to this point, and we would remind the non-resident members of the Delegacy that it is a point of sufficient importance to require their attendance at the meetings of the Delegacy, as well as that of the residents.

ART. IV.—*Essays and Reviews*. London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand. 1860.

As a general rule, we are not disposed to think highly of volumes of essays and reviews, whether the composition of one mind or the contributions of several. Few writers are either brilliant enough or deep enough to justify the republication of fugitive pieces which have appeared in monthly and quarterly reviews; and even when the subjects are new, and the writers varied, the very form of publication seems to indicate that the authors have nothing of great importance to communicate to the world, and that they have rather found a vent for the transmission of the casual thoughts of leisure hours than that they hope to produce anything of permanent value to society at large. Nevertheless, essays are the fashion of the day, and for four successive years we have been presented with one of these purposeless volumes from each of the two English universities; and the fashion has even extended itself to our more sober and cautious brethren of the North, and Edinburgh has produced its rival volume to compete with the productions of Oxford and Cambridge. These essays exhibit, as might have been expected, very different degrees of ability and very different phases of opinion. Some of them have been written on topics of the highest interest, whilst some have from the nature of their subjects secured a very limited circle of readers and admirers. We have called them purposeless, and if the word be objected to as not being a word to be found in Johnson's, or even in more modern English dictionaries, we answer that we think we have a kind of right to invent a new term to describe a new phenomenon in literature. Such essays are wholly destitute of unity of purpose, and the writers are only connected together by the somewhat artificial and, if one may so call it, accidental link of having been educated at the same university. During the year 1859 there seems to have been a pause. Probably there was not to be found a sufficient number of persons connected with either university who had enough to say to fill an octavo of four or five hundred pages; and the occasional repetition of the same name during the four years of their duration seemed to point to a probable termination of this fancy. The idea has, however, revived, and indeed we suppose may be said to have culminated in 1860 in a new volume which represents the thoughts of certain writers without distinction of the univer-

sity at which they were educated. Some of the writers of the work before us have tried their hands before, and the subjects to which they have applied themselves in the present volume are a continuation of those which appeared in previous volumes of the series. Thus Dr. Temple has followed up an essay on national education by some strictures on the education of the world; Professor Powell has advanced from natural theology to the study of the evidence of Christianity; whilst the dissertation on schemes of comprehension by Mr. Wilson is appropriately concluded by an attempt to show how a national Church may adapt itself to the advancing intelligence and developed scepticism of the nineteenth century; and the hieratic papyri of Mr. Goodwin are supplemented by an attempt to show that the Mosaic cosmogony is altogether unworthy of credit. Mr. Pattison alone of the septemvirate has given us his thoughts on a subject which, though certainly not new to him, has never before, we believe, employed his pen. The other two writers, though new names in the series, have devoted themselves to subjects such as might have been expected from them. Dr. Rowland Williams's account of Baron Bunsen's Biblical researches touches upon matter which had been noticed before by him in his essay on Christianity and Hinduism, and the concluding essay, on the interpretation of Scripture, both in tone of writing and in subject-matter, reminds us forcibly of the unhappy attempt of Professor Jowett to elucidate the Epistles of S. Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians. Such are the subjects of the seven essays which fill this remarkable volume. Unlike those that preceded it, it has a purpose; it is prefaced by ten lines of advertisement to the reader; and the object, as stated by the authors themselves, is 'to illustrate the advantage to the 'cause of religion and moral truth from a free handling, in a 'becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the 'repetition of conventional language, and from traditional 'methods of treatment.' We do not know which of the seven composed the sentence, but we have no hesitation in saying that it ought to have come from Mr. Jowett. It may be a matter of taste how far the prevailing tone of the essays indicates 'a becoming spirit.' None of them, undoubtedly, are wanting in free handling; and if a becoming spirit is indicated by unscrupulous assertion of unproved propositions, and an arrogant contempt of those who differ from him, Dr. Rowland Williams must be considered to bear the palm. Certainly none of the essayists can be accused of any respect for conventional language, or deference to traditional modes of treatment. Yet conventional expressions and traditional authority are the especial objects of Mr. Jowett's detestation; and the essay on the interpretation



of Scripture is the particular one which has moulded itself according to this view. The only other subject touched on in this short advertisement, is to deprecate the notion that the authors are responsible for anything beyond the essays to which their respective names are appended, on the ground that 'they have written in entire independence of each other, and without concert or comparison.' It may seem a fair request on the part of a writer, that he should not be considered responsible for what another writer has said; yet, upon the whole, there is enough of uniformity of tone about the articles in the volume before us to enable us to say that we have no doubt most of them would endorse most of what the others have written. And even were this not the case, a question may be raised whether he who gives his name to a publication like this does not in some degree sanction the views adopted by the rest of the writers, though he may not be made answerable for every expression of opinion, or called upon to approve of every argument adopted by his colleagues. Under this view we must express our deep concern at seeing the name of the Head Master of Rugby connected with the other sceptics who have composed the volume. We trust this significant fact will have the effect of opening the eyes of parents and guardians to the real tendency of the teaching which has with more or less uniformity prevailed at Rugby for the last thirty years. The essay itself is too insignificant to require any further notice at our hands. In an intellectual point of view it is poor; and though there are many questionable statements in it, it is far too dull to be likely to do any mischief. It is based on a comparison of the mode of education adopted in the case of an individual and that which seems to have been employed in the education of the world; and the manner in which the comparison is drawn out appears to us to be exceedingly forced and unnatural. We do not, therefore, purpose to notice this essay at greater length, nor to allude to it otherwise than as one of a series of seven essays, of the general tone of which we proceed to give some account before entering upon a more particular criticism of individual writers.

If, then, the religious reader is willing to adopt the views advocated in this volume, let him be prepared for the denial of the canonical authority of several books of Scripture. Mr. Goodwin's knowledge of geology is not profound, but it goes far enough to enable him to pronounce on the impossibility of showing an accordance between the description of Creation and the facts established by modern science. The Mosaic narrative does not correctly represent the history of the universe up to the time of man. It contains the speculations of a Hebrew. Des Cartes, promulgated in all good faith, on the best and most

probable account that could, at the time, be given of the universe. The author gives us no explanation of the fact that there were no facts or supposed laws of nature known at the time which could have led the Hebrew lawgiver to give any preference to the history of creation which he has given us over any other conceivable theory of the world's origin. The doctrine of the inspiration of Moses does not preclude the idea of Moses having received his narrative, either in part or in whole, from tradition; nor does it imply that Moses understood the account of creation which he was inspired to record; but only this, that Moses knew that he was a prophet of God, commissioned to deliver a true account, to be received by his people, as containing all that it was sufficient for them to know for their guidance in life, neither the prophet nor the people understanding the full meaning of the history, and both being liable to mix erroneous conceptions of their own with the truth which they received. Modern geological discovery *seems* to indicate a profounder knowledge of physical science in the Jewish lawgiver than we can possibly attribute to him: neither is it to be expected, as time goes on, that either geological or any other science will indicate much approximation to or discrepancy with the literal text of the Mosaic narrative. However, we do not propose to refute Mr. Goodwin; we are now endeavouring to give our readers some idea of how much of their belief they must give up if they would acquiesce in the conclusions of the seven reviewers. Mr. Goodwin's view, and he has certainly two at least of his colleagues who coincide with him in opinion, is that Moses' account is false, but that he believed it to be true. We urge that if it was false, Moses must certainly have known it to be false, and must be charged with the accusation of palming upon an ignorant multitude for political purposes a pure invention, for the probability of which there was no assignable ground. It is not, it will be observed, the inspiration of the narrative that is called in question; that is a previous question, the solution of which has been taken for granted by our reviewers. The question is, whether the narrative is true, and from the establishment of its falsity it obviously follows that we are at liberty to disbelieve anything else in the Pentateuch that may happen to offend our prejudices. It is true no one is obliged to disbelieve the story of the miraculous gift of speech to Balaam's ass; but neither, on the other hand, need it be regarded as of any greater credit than the history of the Creation. It has unfortunately been quoted in the New Testament by S. Peter, who says,—'Balaam was rebuked for his iniquity: the dumb ass speaking with man's voice forbad the madness of the prophet.' And it certainly is a most awkward quotation for

those who believe the New Testament, but demur to the authority of the Old. But there is a remedy for this difficulty. Our reviewers do not receive the Second Epistle of S. Peter as genuine. It is the work of a later age, and therefore a mere forgery, for it professes to be written by S. Peter. There is no room for any one who may wish it to take the intermediate ground, that though not written by the Apostle, yet it may form a part of canonical Scripture. Not that this is at all the view adopted by the essayists. We only insist upon this because of course it directly militates against the Sixth Article of the Church of England, so that the deniers of the authenticity of the Epistle *seem* to be at issue with the Article to which six out of the seven at least are bound to profess their assent. It is worth while just to notice the calm and cool way in which questions of some moment, as it appears to us Churchmen, are disposed of by these gentlemen. We do not find any direct assertion, much less any elaborate proof, of the forgery of the Epistle. It is quite taken for granted that we are all possessed of the knowledge of so very elementary a truth, and it is only implied in the way of innuendo, the First Epistle of S. Peter not being called by Mr. Wilson by its usual name, but being designated as *the* genuine Epistle of S. Peter. With regard to the difficulty about the Article, we shall recur to that presently. We confine ourselves for the present to the illustration of the amount of disbelief which is necessary in the reader who would conform himself to the doctrine of the reviewers.

Again we repeat, we are not offering any refutation of their views, but only presenting our readers with a bird's-eye view of the whole, as they appear to the gaze of an exoteric criticism. It was not worth while to argue the point of the inspiration of the books of Moses. The absence of any quality such as is usually meant by the term inspiration, in the lowest sense in which it is understood by ordinary readers of the Bible, or used by divines of the Church, from the whole of Scripture covers this argument, just as the greater implies the less, and the whole includes its parts. The non-existence of inspiration is too obvious a point with our reviewers to need proof. The variations in the Gospels, such for instance as the remarkable one discovered by Mr. Jowett, that S. Matthew and S. Luke are at issue about the place of residence of Joseph and Mary, need only be glanced at to satisfy any reasonable inquirer that the Gospels cannot claim to be inspired in the sense of being guaranteed from errors of historical fact. The inspiration of the Gospel narratives being thus summarily disposed of, the rest of the New Testament and the whole of the Old of course easily follow in the train; and when once we have dismissed the tra-

ditional conception of inspiration, it necessarily follows that the books of Scripture may be handled like any other human compositions. This is a great assistance to us as we proceed to the later books of the Old Testament, because it enables us to decide at once and peremptorily, that when in the prophetic books allusions are made to events which are posterior to their supposed date, all such passages are interpolated and belong to a subsequent date. This method is particularly useful when names or events are too definitely alluded to to allow of the allusion being explained away on the principle of vagueness and generality; and has been largely employed by Dr. Rowland Williams, or rather by Baron Bunsen, whose exponent he is, in accounting for the prophetic element in the Psalms, and in Isaiah and Jeremiah. In cases where prophecy has usually been interpreted in a double sense, or a multiple sense, and where there might be difficulty in recognising the fulfilment unless it had been authoritatively explained in the Gospels and Epistles, the answer is obvious: the Jewish mind was full of these prophecies, and saw the accomplishment of type and prophecy in events to which the type or prophecy presents scarcely the faintest resemblance; and the evangelists and other writers of the New Testament were either led away by the common prejudice, or condescended to it. Dr. Williams's essay professes to give an account of Bunsen's Biblical researches—and in point of fact consists of a fulsome panegyric of the author, ending with the following ridiculous couple of stanzas—from which it would appear that the cosmogony of Moses, demonstrated to be false by Mr. Goodwin, is destined to yield to that of Bunsen. To exhibit the complete idea of the ludicrous, as presented by these verses, we should have to wait for a few years, when some more sagacious sceptic has overthrown the theories of the Baron, and established a more satisfactory contradiction of the chronology of Scripture history. Nevertheless, they are good enough under present circumstances to be worth transcribing; they run as follows:—

- ‘ Bunsen, with voice like sound of trumpet born,  
 Conscious of strength and confidently bold,  
 Will feign the sons of Loyola the scorn  
 Which from thy books would scare their startled fold—  
 To thee our Earth disclosed her purple morn,  
 And Time his long-lost centuries unroll'd;  
 Far realms unveiled the mystery of their tongue,  
 Thou all their garlands on the CROSS hast hung.
- ‘ My lips but ill could frame thy Lutheran speech,  
 Nor suits thy Teuton vaunt our British pride—  
 But ah! not dead my soul to giant reach,  
 That envious Eld's vast interval defied;

And when those fables strange our hirelings teach,  
 I saw by genuine learning cast aside,  
 Even like Linnæus kneeling on the sod,  
 For faith from falsehood severed thank I God.'

We have represented Dr. Williams as principally concerned in the attack on the prophetic writings. But he deals an occasional blow at other parts of the Old Testament. He does not, it is true, interfere with Mr. Goodwin's province, which appears to be the lead of the philosophical attack on the historical parts of Genesis; Dr. Williams's line is purely historical, and it is satisfactory to learn, on his authority, that there may be some truth in the narrative of the first book of Moses from the time of Abraham onwards—not that we are to believe the history precisely as is there related. The temptation of Abraham appears under a new version. We are told that 'when the fierce ritual of Syria, with the awe of a Divine voice, bade Abraham slay his son, he did not reflect that he had no perfect theory of the absolute to justify him in departing from traditional revelation, but trusted that the *Father*, whose voice from heaven he heard at heart, was better pleased with mercy than with sacrifice, and this trust was his righteousness.' We are describing a volume, and need not concern ourselves with individuals; but it is scarcely possible to avoid noticing the arrogant and sneering tone of this writer in attacking those from whom he has the misfortune to differ. He has devoted four pages to the one object of holding up to ridicule the hypocrisy of writers who, from Justin Martyr to the present day, have believed in what this author calls the predictive element in prophecy. The invectives on Mr. Mansel and Dr. Pusey are consigned to a note, we suppose because the former has never written anything on the subject of prophecy, and the volume of the latter on the minor prophets was when this volume appeared unpublished. Dr. Rowland Williams's intellectual as well as moral career has been rapid since the publication of the volume on Christianity and Hinduism. It is fearfully instructive. He has one idol, and that idol is Baron Bunsen. With regard to almost every English Churchman mentioned in this essay his tone is altogether offensive and unbecoming; and it is the more unbecoming in one whose belief is such as, according to ordinarily received canons of honesty, must exclude him from the position which he holds in the Church of England. We proceed to the continuation of the subject of prophecy as interpreted by the seven reviewers. Prophecy with them resolves itself into, (I.) Sagacious conjectures about the future when coming events are casting their shadows before them; and this is an adequate account of the denunciations of Nahum against Nineveh, and of Jeremiah against Tyre, on the ground that the

Babylonian power was extending itself over Asia, to which is added for the occasion the fiction that Nebuchadnezzar was mustering his armies; (II.) Into descriptions of contemporary events which have no reference whatever to any future event, such as the Christian Church, following the line of interpretation adopted by the canonical writers of the New Testament, has uniformly adopted, as the fulfilment of the prophecy; and on this ground the prophecy of Micah about Bethlehem Ephratah is explained away, no notice being taken of S. Matthew's exposition of it. This method affords also an easy explanation of the prophecy of Isaiah vii. 16. He, we are told, he, that is Baron Bunsen, can never listen to any one who pretends that the maiden's child of Isaiah vii. 16 was not to be born in the reign of Ahaz, as a sign against the kings Pekah and Rezin. We pass over the appearance of wilful misapprehension here, as if those who cherished the words of prophecy in their application to the Messiah were bound to ignore every other possible interpretation of them.

But our reviewers consider that the Scriptures have but one sense, and that sense being discovered to their satisfaction, ignore all other meanings, and write as if the catholic interpretation must needs be fettered by the same narrow rule. Again we say we are not refuting but explaining; yet, for the sake of exhibiting the contrast between the modern interpretation of Rationalism and the received sense of eighteen centuries, as interpreted by the authority to which till lately all Christendom bowed, we will merely extract the prophecy and its interpretation, at the risk of being charged with unnecessarily quoting passages which most people know by heart. The passage in Isaiah runs as follows:—

'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.' S. Matthew tells us that 'All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.' The question as to the truth of the facts themselves will come before us hereafter. We are now representing the reviewers' interpretation of prophecy. (III.) A third method of diminishing the force of prophecy consists in objecting to the versions of the original, whether the Greek, the Vulgate, or the English, on which stress has usually been laid. Thus a clause of another grand prophecy of Isaiah is disposed of. We will first give the prophecy. 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father,



'The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever.' There is just a doubt whether the term Mighty God may not be more correctly rendered The strong and mighty One; and granting the fact to be established ever so clearly, what, it will be asked, is its value? How much does it weaken or invalidate the splendid passage in which it occurs? Is it meant to be insinuated that the mis-translation of this passage makes any conceivable amount of diminution from the evidence of the true Deity of the Child spoken of by the prophet? (IV.) Lastly, when the allusions are so distinct that there is no other method of evasion, a little conjectural criticism is applied, by which it is made to appear so plainly that he who runs may read it, that the prophet is describing past events, and thus the period of weeks ending in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and those portions of the Book of Daniel supposed to be specially predictive, are represented as a history of past occurrences up to that reign. There is no pleasing Dr. Williams. Prophecies are either too vague or they are too definite; the poetical and the historical element are alike got rid of: nay, so greedy is our author in his work of destruction, that he will not allow standing room for such parts of Scripture as cannot by any possibility be included by any criticism under any of the four heads of destruction which have swept away so much.

The eminently philosophical method which consigns the remaining prophecies to annihilation, is by means of the assertion that if they do not come under the same category with the rest, they ought to do so. In the words of the essay, 'It avails little that some passages are doubtful, capable of being 'made directly Messianic,' or 'foreshadowing the final fall of Jerusalem.' Even these few cases, the remnant of so much confident rhetoric, tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry. Our author's admiration of his hero goes great lengths. On the one hand, he thinks that if in the course of these investigations Bunsen had ignored the discoveries of modern philology, unable to survive the storm of ridicule to which he would have subjected himself from his countrymen, he must have committed suicide by drowning himself in the Neckar (p. 70). On the other hand, he cannot sufficiently admire the mind which amidst such a flood of light still does not despair of Hebrew prophecy as a witness to the kingdom of God—but here the disciple outstrips his master—and when Bunsen in a fit of passing generosity admits a sort of clairvoyant vision of particulars, as a natural gift however, and

of course consistent with fallibility, his encomiast ventures to hope that he only intended the power of seeing the ideal in the actual, or of tracing the Divine government in the movements of men. The writer thinks it unfortunate that Bunsen seems to have believed in something more than presentiment or sagacity, and demurs to the want of evidence for this element in his system. Neither can he relate without a smile the opinions of his hero as to the truth of the personality of Jonah. It would be too painful a task to follow the writer through the series of denials and disbeliefs which appear in the account of the mode in which the most sacred parts of Isaiah and the other prophets are explained away; but as in the examination which we propose to give of some of the essays in this volume, we shall not recur to this particular one again, we extract the following passage as exhibiting a fair specimen of Dr. Williams's sneering tone and unscrupulous misrepresentation of those who differ from him. It will moreover give the reader some idea of what his belief really is, and what are the ends he proposes to himself to accomplish.

'It provokes a smile' (p. 77) 'on serious topics to observe the zeal with which our critic vindicates the personality of Jonah, and the originality of his hymn (the latter being generally thought doubtful), while he proceeds to explain that the narrative of our book in which the hymn is imbedded contains a late legend founded on misconception. One can imagine the cheers which the opening of such an essay might evoke in some of our own circles, changing into indignation as the distinguished foreigner developed his views. After this he might speak more gently of mythical theories. But if such a notion alarms those who think that, apart from omniscience belonging to the Jews, the proper conclusion of reason is Atheism, it is not inconsistent with the idea that Almighty God has been pleased to educate men and nations, employing imagination no less than conscience, and suffering his lessons to play freely within the limits of humanity and its shortcomings. Nor will any fair reader rise from the prophetic disquisitions without feeling that he has been under the guidance of a master's hand. The great result is to vindicate the work of the Eternal Spirit; that abiding influence, which as our Church teaches us in the Ordination Service, underlies all others, and in which converge all images of old time and means of grace now: temple, Scripture, finger, and hand of God; and again, preaching, sacraments, waters which comfort, and flame which burns. If such a Spirit did not dwell in the Church, the Bible would not be inspired, for the Bible is before all things the written voice of the congregation. Bold as such a theory of inspiration may sound, it was the earliest creed of the Church, and it is the only one to which the facts of Scripture answer. The sacred writers acknowledge themselves men of like passions with ourselves, and we are promised illumination from the Spirit which dwelt in them. Hence, when we find our Prayer-Book constructed on the idea of the Church being an inspired society, instead of objecting that every one of us is fallible, we should define inspiration consistently with the facts of Scripture and of human nature. These would neither exclude the idea of fallibility among Israelites of old, nor teach us to quench the Spirit in true hearts for ever. But if any one prefers thinking the sacred writers pas-

sionless machines, and calling Luther and Milton "uninspired," let him co-operate in researches by which his theory if true will be triumphantly confirmed. Let him join in considering it a religious duty to print the most genuine text of those words which he calls Divine; let him yield no grudging assent to the removal of demonstrated interpolations in our text, or errors in our translation; let him give English equivalents for its Latinisms, once natural, but now become deceptive; let him next trace fairly the growth of our complex doctrines out of scriptural germs, whether of simple thought or of Hebrew idiom; then, if he be not prepared to trust our Church with a larger freedom in incorporating into her language the results of such inquiry, and adapting one-sided forms to wider experience, he will at least have acquired such a knowledge of this field of thought as may induce him to treat labourers in it with respect. A recurrence to first principles, even of Revelation, may to minds prudent or timid seem a process of more danger than advantage, and it is possible to defend our traditional theology, if stated reasonably, and with allowance for the accidents of its growth. But what is not possible with honesty, is to uphold a fabric of mingled faith and speculation, and in the same breath to violate the instinct which believed, and blindfold the mind which reasoned. It would be strange if God's work were preserved by disparaging the instruments which his wisdom chose for it.'

The reason which we have already urged for quoting this passage, in a portion of our article in which we had not at first intended to allude to separate writers in this volume, must serve as our excuse also for extracting one or two more passages, referring not to the subject of prophecy, but to the New Testament.

'The verse, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down," is intelligible as a free comment near the end of the first century, but has no meaning in our Lord's mouth at a time when the ascension had not been heard of.'—P. 84.

Again:—

'The Apocalypse, if taken as a series of political visions which represent the outpouring of the vials of wrath upon the city when the Lord was slain, ceases to be a riddle.'—*Ibid.*

Again:—

'The second of the Petrine Epistles having alike external and internal evidence against its genuineness, it necessarily surrendered as a whole; and our critic's good faith in this respect is more certain than the ingenuity with which he reconstructs a part of it. The second chapter may not improbably be a quotation; but its quoter and the author of the rest of the Epistle need not therefore have been S. Peter. Where so many points are handled, fancifulness in some may be pardoned, and indulgence is needed for the eagerness with which S. Paul is made a widower, because some fathers misunderstood the texts "true yokefellow, and leading about a sister."—P. 86.

Again:—

'The first Christians held that the heart was purified by faith; the accompanying symbol, water, became by degrees the instrument of purifi-

cation. Holy baptism was at first preceded by a vow, in which the young soldier expressed his consciousness of spiritual truth; but when it became twisted into a false analogy with circumcision, the rite degenerated into a magical form, and the Augustinian notion of a curse inherited by infants was developed in connexion with it.—P. 86.

Again:—

‘Salvation from evil through sharing the Saviour’s spirit was shifted into a notion of purchase from God through the price of his bodily pangs’! (P. 87.) And, ‘The fall of Adam represents with him ideally the circumscription of our spirits in limits of flesh and time, and practically the selfish nature with which we fall from the likeness of God which should be fulfilled.’

Lastly, we do not know whether more to wonder at the impudence, or to be indignant at the dishonesty, of the following attempt to identify the precise and definite statements of S. Athanasius with the vague and misty analogies of the German Rationalist.

‘Being, becoming, and animating, or substance, thinking, and conscious life, are expressions of a Triad which may be also represented as will, wisdom, and love, as light, radiance, and warmth, as fountain, stream, and united flow, as mind, thought, and consciousness, as person, word, and life, as Father, Son, and Spirit. In virtue of such identity of Thought with Being, the primitive Trinity represented neither their originating principles nor their transient phases, but their eternal inherencies in one Divine Mind. The Unity of God as the eternal Father is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. But the Divine Consciousness, or Wisdom, consubstantial with the Eternal Will becoming personal in the Son of man, is the express image of the Father, and Jesus actually, but also mankind ideally, is the Son of God.’

One word more, and we have done with Dr. Williams. His contemptuous mode of speaking of the advocates of the catholic doctrine, and classing them under an indiscriminate head as ignoring the whole field of modern theological literature, and repeating the unmeaning shibboleths of a party, shows that he is either very ignorant or very dishonest. If he does not know, he certainly might if he would take the trouble to become acquainted with the fact that the Anglican school, whom he takes so much pains to vilify, contains men who are as well acquainted as himself with the writings of the rationalist party, but who are not quite so precipitate in rushing into their conclusions;—men who have seen the same philosophical system in the writings of Spinoza, and to whom the whole theory, with the exception only of the Biblical criticism, which is new, was known long before the appearance of the Egypt or the Hippolytus. Moreover, it may be worth Dr. Williams’s while to consider whether what may be excusable in a Lutheran who, to use his own language, is ‘a philosopher sitting loose to our Articles,’ is becoming or in any way justifiable in a clergyman who is

bound by the Articles and the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. We have no wish to interfere with the speculations of a Lutheran, but it is idle to pretend that such theories are reconcileable with the doctrines of the Church of England.

We have digressed considerably from our subject in order that we might dismiss this essay—once for all. We have attempted no refutations of its criticism; as that would be the work of a volume rather than an article. The essay itself, as distinguished from the others, is principally remarkable for its attack on prophecy. Of the two bulwarks of revelation, according to the view of Protestants, one has been cut clean away; the other, the evidence of miracles, is undermined in the succeeding essay, on the study of the evidence of Christianity, from the pen of Professor Powell. We shall happily be excused from saying much on this subject; the recent death of the author prevents him from defending his own views, but we may observe, that the essay contains little that is new. In a previous number of this Review we endeavoured to do justice to the remarkable view of the writer insisting on the absolute impossibility of a miracle, and his simultaneous profession of belief in the facts recorded in the New Testament, including the birth, death, resurrection and ascension of our Blessed Lord. All we here insist upon is, that the 'free handling' which the volume claims as its right, issues on the denial alike of prophetic inspiration and miraculous agency; that the becoming spirit has shown some tolerable consistency in its rejection of the Old Testament history, but is somewhat illogical when it attempts to deal with the New. We have also just touched upon the previous question, how far the adoption of such view is consistent with good faith on the part of the writers.

It may not, however, be entirely out of place here to notice the entire want of real philosophical power that characterises these essays. The most striking instance of this occurs in Professor Powell's Essay, in a passage in which he is arguing against the value of testimony, which he calls a secondhand assurance and a blind guide which can avail nothing. He takes the opportunity to contrast a most undeniable truth—which has been enunciated many times before, and will have to be insisted upon again whenever Professor Faraday or any other experimental lecturer is illustrating this subject—with another truth which is quite independent of it, and has, in point of fact, nothing to do with it. Professor Faraday is quoted in defence of the position, that as the mere contracted experience of the senses is liable to deception, the errors of sense ought to be corrected by a careful recurrence to the consideration of natural laws and extended

analogies. In contradiction to this is alleged the dictum of Abercrombie and Chalmers, that 'on a certain amount of testimony we might believe any statement, however improbable.' Now what is meant by this last proposition is clear enough and undeniable, though Professor Powell has expressed it in most inaccurate language. But what we are concerned with here, is that in endeavouring to put out this dictum in antagonism to the other, he applies it in the following words: 'So, that if a number of respectable witnesses were to concur in asseverating that on a certain occasion they had seen two and two make five, we should be bound to believe them.' (P. 141.) Now, not to insist on the gross error of confounding probable and demonstrative evidence which is shown here, what an extreme confusion is there in this writer's mind between '*fact*' and '*truth*.' Surely testimony has to do with fact. Imagine the concrete phenomenon with its accidents of time, and place, and circumstances, which should suggest the idea of the abstract property of numbers that two and two make five! Now this is seriously proposed by Professor Powell as what he calls an extreme case. The other alleged instance is almost equally absurd, but we have no space to expose its extravagance here; we are not arguing in favour of testimony, but exhibiting the confusion of thought of the writer; and one instance of want of logical power is as good as a thousand in showing the untrustworthiness of his whole argument.

We proceed to give some account of the more remarkable of these essays, in particular. And first we have to notice the essay on 'The National Church,' which, though not professedly introductory to the rest, for it occupies the centre, may be considered the pioneer essay, as it in fact breaks the ground for the rest by incidentally showing what amount of dissent from the Articles of the Church of England is thought to be compatible with an honest profession of adopting them. The advantage which this essay gains for its associates, if the author's theory may be considered tenable, is this, that in estimating the remaining dissertations in the volume we may keep out of sight the fact that the authors are all not only members of the Church of England, but, with a single exception, clergymen who have professed their assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and the formularies of the Church of England as contained in the Book of Common Prayer; for there will be no difficulty in extending the argument which the Vicar of Great Staughton confines to the Articles, so as to make it include the Prayer-Book also. It is true that the Prayer-Book is not in itself ambiguous, whilst the Articles unquestionably are so, whether intentionally or not, and the



difficulty of setting aside the Prayer-Book, which is in reality greater, is, under Mr. Wilson's hypothesis, considerably less, inasmuch as he does not affect to agree with the expressions of the formularies or the intentions of their framers. He is content if he can establish that there is some mode in which they can be acquiesced in, the statements of them being taken in separate parcels, and the colouring, tone, effect, or purpose of the whole being entirely ignored. From what has been already said, it will have been seen that we consider it simply dishonest to profess the compatibility of such views as are contained in this volume with the doctrines of the Church. We should be content to leave the issue to the judgment of any intelligent and fair dissenter; but as it is obvious that doctrines are rather for the most part implied than expressed in a book of devotion, the writer directs his special efforts to show that what he holds is not absolutely inconsistent with adherence to the formularies, his assent to which entitles him to hold the vicarage of Great Staughton.

Many of our readers will be old enough to recollect the publication of the celebrated tract which brought the 'Tracts for the Times' to an abrupt conclusion. For such as may not be able to remember much of Church controversy as it existed fifteen or twenty years ago, we may be permitted to explain that the author of this essay is the same individual who figured upon that occasion as one of the four tutors who signed the protest against No. XC. Surely a heathen would have read the Nemesis which a Christian's thoughts will construe as the necessary consequence of erroneous views, viz. to be obliged to contradict themselves, as time goes on, and change of circumstances arise. Here is the very person who was so shocked at the attempt to reconcile Anglican with Roman doctrine, in a portion of their developments, bent on showing that a Churchman may receive the Articles though he does not believe them, may profess his assent to them at the same time that he differs entirely from certain statements contained in them, and from what he admits to be the general tenor of their meaning.

It is but justice to Mr. Wilson to observe, that he does not understate what he believes or disbelieves in order to screw it into conformity with statements which appear to contradict it. He does not for a moment attempt to conceal, for instance, his belief that the Second Epistle of S. Peter is a forgery; that the Gospel of S. John was written long after S. John's death; that if priests and ministers of religion, including heathen and Christian, were swept from the face of the earth, they would soon be reproduced; that the brotherhood of men

does not really depend upon the material fact of their fleshly descent from a single pair; that we cannot depend upon the accuracy of the Old Testament history of any period anterior to the taking of Jerusalem by Shishak; that though Buddhism may be called the gospel of India, preached five or six centuries before the Gospel of Jesus was proclaimed in the nearer East, it would be nearer the truth to say that the Christian revelation was given to the western world because it deserved it better, and was more prepared for it than the East; that Calvinistic and Lutheran theories, as well as sacramental and hierarchical ones, must be abandoned, now that people have attained to the true understanding of the words of the Lord Jesus, which appear to the writer to declare that the conditions of men in another world will be determined by their moral characters in this, and not by their hereditary and traditional creeds; that S. John's expression, 'the whole world lieth in wickedness,' compared with S. Paul's exhortation 'to make prayers and supplications for all men,' seems to prove that S. John's charity, though more intense towards the brethren, was circumscribed within narrower limits than S. Paul's; that it is an erroneous notion to style the Jewish constitution a theocracy in a peculiar and exclusive sense because the religious element was much stronger than has been supposed in other nationalities; and that in respect of a State religion, Jew and Gentile were much alike; that the Bible, though it contains a bright centre of spiritual truth within, is disfigured by dark patches of human passion and error; that accounts of things such as occur in the four Gospels, which are only to be reconciled in the way of hypothesis and conjecture, cannot be supposed to have been suggested by the Holy Spirit; that the restraints of creeds and articles, implying as they do the expectation that all ministers, however much they may know, shall be of one opinion in theoreticals, show a strange ignoring of the constitution of the human mind; that the course of preparation for ordination, implying a system of truth of which the candidate ought to be convinced, has an enervating effect upon the mind; that we ought not to consider the Church of Christ to be founded on the possession of an abstractedly true and supernaturally communicated speculation concerning God, but upon the manifestation of a Divine life in man; that the idea of rescuing oneself from perdition, attaining a crown of glory in which so many have no share, and of the finality of the sentence of the day of judgment, rather tends to unfit men for this world, and in so doing prepares them very ill for that which is to come; that Christianity is very different from what it would have been without the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle; that Jesus is no

less the son of David in idea and spiritually, even though He were not so really; that all, both small and great, good and bad, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent, to repose or be quickened into higher life, in the ages to come, according to His will.

Such are a few of the expressed opinions of Mr. Wilson which we have extracted from his essay, and given as nearly in his own words as was consistent with brevity and perspicuity. It will be thought strange if the sanction of the Thirty-nine Articles be claimed for these opinions; neither does the writer claim it; he limits himself to the vindication of his right to hold them simultaneously with subscription to the Articles. Neither must it be supposed that the writer is anxious to try the case of compatibility. The statements which we have collected by no means appear as an isolated series of propositions, put forth as a challenge, like the reckless assertions which many of our readers will remember in the 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' upon which it was intended that an issue should be tried. On the contrary, they appear as it were only incidentally in the course of a dissertation, the subject of which is the prospects and the duties of the National Church. Most unprejudiced readers, probably the writer himself, would admit that they are far more audacious, though not so tauntingly expressed, as the views which Mr. Ward attempted to exhibit as consistent with the theory of Anglicanism. But fifteen years have wonderfully changed the position of affairs; and the writer who in his letter to Mr. Churton endeavoured to show that the Articles had a meaning, is now bent upon proving that that meaning, whatever it be, need not be held by those who profess to accept the formularies of the Church of England. We believe the term non-natural sense, which has almost become proverbial since that time, was then invented by Mr. Ward, as he honestly admitted that his sense was not the sense intended, though he contended it was consistent with their grammatical phraseology. We shall not be overstating the case, if we say that Mr. Wilson's explanations strike us as being exceedingly non-natural. But the reader shall judge for himself how far Mr. Wilson's justification of his position may be admitted. We repeat, however, that it is not with the view of justifying his position that the explanation of the true mode of subscription to the Articles is introduced, but rather with the view of showing, that however advisable it would be to do away with the Articles, such a course being manifestly impracticable, the next best solution of the difficulty which they present to latitudinarians is to establish if possible, that though they must be signed, they need not be believed.

The chief point made, is the absence of certain expressions

from the Sixth Article, which the author of the essay calls the pivot article of the Church. In it he observes there is no definition of Inspiration, and there is nothing to show that 'Canonical' means 'miraculously inspired,' though he tells us that the Fathers usually considered these as synonymous terms. Accordingly, with the help of the logical formula that universal affirmations are not convertible propositions, it comes out that the Word of God, though contained in Scripture, is not co-extensive with it. Hence it is made to appear, that under the terms of the Sixth Article, one may accept literally or allegorically, or as parable, or poetry, or legend, the story of a serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, of a revival of its motion, of waters standing in a solid heap, of witches, and a variety of apparitions. In like manner, he continues, every one is free, under the terms of the Sixth Article, to disbelieve the primeval institution of the Sabbath, the universality of the Deluge, the confusion of tongues, the corporeal taking up of Elijah into heaven, the reality of demoniacal possession, the personality of Satan. Now if the Sixth Article of the Church of England were the only document that alluded to these doctrines, there is no denying that it will not touch him who impugns them, so far that is as the grammatical construction of its terms goes; but to represent this argument in its true light, we will add, that neither, so far as this particular document is concerned, can there be any necessity for belief in the Trinity of Persons, in the Unity of the Godhead, in the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Personality or existence of the Holy Ghost, nor in a number of other doctrines which perhaps Mr. Wilson may wish to leave open questions, but which members of the Church of England are happily not yet prepared to surrender. Again, the same kind of reasoning might be extended to any other Article which alludes to some definite subject. Thus it would be very consistent to deny that the three Creeds could be proved from Holy Scripture, and to assert that they ought therefore to be dismissed from the Prayer-Book, at the very time that the person doing so asserted his unequivocal belief in the Seventh Article, which affirms that there is no contradiction between the Old and New Testaments. It would be easy for any one to say that he adopted this Article in its strict letter, for that neither the one nor the other in his judgment gave any countenance to the dogmatic statements of the Creeds. It will be said that Mr. Wilson is putting an extreme case, and that we ought not to tie him down so exactly to that which is only an illustration which he brings to throw light upon his argument. Moreover, he has

selected the Sixth as the pivot Article of the Church of England, and does not at all mean to intimate that persons may, under cover of its grammatical expression, disbelieve what is contained in the other Articles. Of course he does not. And yet his mode of stating the case, which looks peculiarly logical, amounts nearly to this. He does in reality ignore every other document which asserts or implies that the Church of England adopts any of these statements. And above all, and what is much more important, he ignores the whole body of truth which the Church of England inherited from antiquity, and has, with almost no variation, consistently maintained since the Reformation. It is quite childish to say that in any communion a person is at liberty to hold any statement as true, the formal contradiction of which in words is not imposed upon him as a test of membership. A man would be thought to act dishonourably who for motives of gain or for whatever reason joined the fraternity of Quakers, and who should allege in justification of his conduct in breaking any one of their rules that he had not subscribed any agreement to observe it. And equally dishonest is it to continue in office teaching in the Church of England doctrines which the teacher (if so be) knows to run counter to the whole tenor of her history, and which have no countenance in the words of her formularies or the teaching of her divines.

Mr. Wilson, after having shown what latitude with regard to points not alluded to in the Sixth Article is allowable to a person who is obliged to subscribe this particular Article, proceeds to argue the case of subscription generally; and here he appears to be aware that the pivot Article does not embrace and comprehend within itself the other Articles, or he would probably not be so anxious to establish a point which would be clear, viz. that any opinions whatever may be held consistently with the subscription to the remaining thirty-eight. He must surely feel the difficulties of subscription to be great. His wish is to establish an equal freedom for ministers and laity. The freedom, he says, which is enjoyed by the members of a congregation cannot be denied to its ministers without injustice. This is a simple absurdity, and may be shown at once to be so by a *reductio ad absurdum*, for as there is nothing in point of law to allow persons professing themselves members of the Church of England, in private life to hold what they please, for they are never obliged to express their assent either to articles of religion or formularies of faith, so the clergyman who was under the same law of liberty might be allowed also to believe anything or nothing. The restraints, or the appearances of restraints, as they are correctly termed, on the supposed truth of the author's hypothesis, are these same awkward Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

He is far too honest to wish to shield himself under his own allegation, that as far as opinion is privately entertained, the liberty of the English clergyman is complete, as he cannot be troubled for that which he has not actually expressed, it having been expressly ruled that the *ex-officio* oath, compelling a person to confess or accuse himself, cannot be tendered to any person whatever. The grievance is not that clergymen are restrained from thinking what they like, but from expressing their opinions; and the imposition of subscription to the Articles is the burden from which relief is sought. The author is well aware that this is not to be had; that temporary as is the nature of many of the Articles, and ambiguously expressed as many more are, which is Mr. Wilson's opinion of them, there is no probability of the present or the next generation witnessing their authoritative removal from the law of the Church. We say from the law of the Church, not from the Prayer-Book; for in point of fact they have no business in the Prayer-Book, of which they form no part, neither can they be fairly called the inheritance of English Churchmen in that sense which the Prayer-Book undoubtedly is. They form no part of the 'Sealed Books;' neither are they printed in the *Editio Princeps* of the Prayer-Book in 1662; nor again was it customary to insert them in Prayer-Books till quite recent times. We can only suppose that the custom of having them bound up at the end of the Prayer-Book with the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, gradually led to their being retained in the smaller Prayer-Books when the Canons were excluded as increasing the bulk of the book too much.

To return to Mr. Wilson's method of enlarging the liberty of the English clergyman. The difficulty of defining the legal obligation of those who sign the Articles (and the legal obligation is the measure of the moral obligation) is considerable. The very vagueness of subscription may be thought imperative on the conscience, as the act is enjoined, but the effect or meaning of subscription not stated. Mr. Wilson gathers the meaning from the Fifth and Thirty-sixth Canons:—

*'Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam.'*

Who would have ever thought of a latitudinarian appealing to the Canons of the Provincial Council of Canterbury as containing anything binding on the Church at large? But Mr. Wilson's desire of explaining what the words of a Canon do not necessarily include in their grammatical meaning, outweighs even the consideration that he might have slighted the Canons as applicable only in the province of Canterbury, and perhaps intrenched himself in the position that the meaning of



subscription to the Articles is unexplained and inexplicable. With regard to the Fifth Canon, it forbids any one to call the Articles superstitious or erroneous, and it would seem obvious that the person who signs an Article believes it to be in some sense true, and therefore not erroneous. The addition of the word *superstitious* we should have thought somewhat abridged the liberty of conscience, as it is quite consistent with believing statements to be true in words, to consider them as superstitious, *i.e.* tending to create false ideas of God and religion. But Mr. Wilson finds no such difficulty in the wording of this Canon. He says, and truly, that an Article may be very inexpedient, or become so; we are quite prepared to admit that some of the Articles may not have been very expedient at the time when they were drawn up, or may have become much less so now. He continues, 'It may be unintelligible, or not easily intelligible, to ordinary people; it may be controversial, and such as to provoke controversy, and keep it alive when otherwise it would subside; it may revive unnecessarily the remembrance of dead controversies—all or any of these without being erroneous; and though not superstitious, some expressions may appear so, such as those which seem to impute an occult operation to the Sacraments. The Fifth Canon does not touch the affirming any of these things, and more especially that the Articles present truths disproportionately, and relatively to ideas not now current.' When one thing does not touch another at all, we should have thought it unnecessary to add that more especially it does not touch a particular part of it. Perhaps the mode of expression may indicate a little misgiving on the writer's part whether contact is so entirely disapproved. As to the gradual ascent from the idea of being inexpedient, to that of being and then appearing unintelligible, controversial, and seemingly superstitious, we will not call the style of innuendo Jesuitical, because it is not nearly clever enough to deserve the epithet. The animus is far too transparent. There is another Canon however, the Thirty-sixth, which, as this writer thinks, affords some light as to subscription. The wording of it is to the effect that the subscriber '*alloweth* the book of Articles,' and that he '*acknowledgeth* the same to be agreeable to the Word of God.' And here again, in attempting to explain and modify these expressions, we have a curious mixture of self-evident propositions and evasive arguments. The writer begins as usual with the self-evident, and the appearance of candour and moderation carry us a great way; but whether the apparent ease with which he takes us across the country will enable us to take the ugly fence at which we arrive at last, this the reader shall judge for himself from the following account of the run.

Allowance is not altogether the same thing as cordial approval. We allow much that we do not think wise or practically useful; as the less of two evils, or an evil which cannot be remedied, or of which the remedy is not in our power, or concerning which there is much difference of opinion, or where the initiation of change, or the responsibility does not belong to us. People gladly and in conscience submit to and 'allow' a law which they would be horror-struck to have enacted, as part of a constitution under which they live, and against which they would not rebel, which they would on no account undermine, for the many blessings of which they are fully grateful. This is Mr. Wilson's argument. But we may reply that it may be questioned whether the term 'allow' has not been lowered in meaning by modern usage since it was first used in the canon. So much for the word *allowance*; we come next to *acknowledgment*. Here, too, we begin with an incontrovertible truism. In acknowledging the correspondence of a proposition to the Word of God a man does not regard it as self-evident, nor originate it as his own feeling, spontaneous opinion or conviction, but when it is put in a certain shape, when the intention of the framers is borne in mind, their probable purpose and design explained, together with the difficulties which surrounded them, he is not prepared to contradict, and he acknowledges. There is a great deal to be said which had not at first occurred to him; many other better and wiser men than himself have acknowledged the same thing—why should he be obstinate? Besides, he is young, and has plenty of time to reconsider it; or he is old, and continues to submit out of habit, and it would be too absurd at his time of life to be setting up as a Church Reformer. The absurdity of this, as an instance of conscientious subscription to the Articles, is too glaring to be commented on. The provision for the subscriptions of the young and the old strikes us as irresistibly ludicrous when we remember that no provision is made for those who have the misfortune to be middle-aged.

But we have not yet done with this writer's special pleadings. Supposing that the explanation given above does not seem satisfactory, we have yet another refuge left. The important phrase is, that the Articles are agreeable to the Word of God, a phrase which is explained to mean what we suppose no one was ever idiot enough to doubt, that the Articles are not precisely coextensive with the Bible, much less of equal authority with it as a whole. What the appearance of *à fortiori* argument in this is, we are quite at a loss to conjecture. They are either expressed in Scripture terms or they are not so expressed. If they are, there can be no difficulty to anybody in accepting them who

accepts Scripture; and if they are not, the pivot Article undertakes for them that they do not contradict Scripture. If we were to argue that this mode of reasoning renders the Articles absolutely nugatory, and shows that the Church of England had better have imposed Scripture upon its members, and left alone the use of dogmatic phraseology, we have to observe that that is exactly the conclusion the writer wishes to be drawn. We may add, that it is a conclusion far better drawn out and shown to be in accordance with the principles of Protestantism by Archdeacon Blackburn in the celebrated 'Confessional.' We have followed the author far enough in this discussion, and we have only to add, that he concludes it with urging the claims which disbelief in certain doctrines and propositions more or less controverted in the volume has to coexist with a reception of the Articles. Such are the questions concerning the dates and composition of the books of the Old Testament, the compilation of the Pentateuch, the introduction of Daniel into the Jewish Canon, the authenticity of S. John's Gospel.

It would be very unjust to accuse Mr. Wilson of dishonesty after speaking so pointedly and openly his opinion as to the honesty of subscribing to the Articles without believing them; yet it certainly seems like a dishonest evasion when he endeavours to represent the statute 13 Eliz. cap. 12, which requires a declaration of *assent* from beneficed persons, as in accordance with his theory. Many people will think it a very poor justification, but the fault we find is not that the case is but poorly made out, but that the writer has wholly ignored the provisions of the Thirty-sixth Canon, which are much more stringent than those of the statute, and which exact a declaration that the subscriber willingly and *ex animo* sets his hand to all contained in the Thirty-nine Articles. If willingly and *ex animo* means in the case of a young person that he will think about it, and in the case of an elderly person that he is too old to think about it, then Mr. Wilson's theory of subscription is all that can be desired. We are anxious, however, not to deprive Mr. Wilson of the benefit of an argument to which he is quite entitled if he thinks it will assist his views. Many people think that there is absolutely no such thing as a complete and entire assent to, and cordial acceptance of, the Prayer-Book of the Church of England and the Thirty-nine Articles without a preference being entertained for one or the other. It would be unfair if we did not state the case as plainly as we can, for it is at first sight a startling phenomenon—it is this: that most people think it impossible to accept the Prayer-Book in its obvious sense—that is, in the sense in which the prayers and formularies were first drawn up, and the Articles in the sense which their framers

attach to them. There is a *prima facie* appearance of dishonesty in such a double subscription.

We do not care to endorse the assertion of the statesman who described the Church of England as having a Popish Prayer-Book, an Arminian clergy, and Calvinistic Articles; but the description has so often been repeated, that we may say it is one which is not unlikely to suggest itself to a mere looker on. Let it be granted then for the sake of Mr. Wilson's argument, that in many minds there must be a silent preference for either the Prayer-Book or the Articles; and that those who prefer either, must ease one into accordance with the other. And it may be asked what right we have to draw the line arbitrarily at this exact point, and say that any subscription that involves a greater inconsistency than this is dishonest. We should like to have such questions as open as possible, but we must be permitted to observe, that there appears to us a long interval between the endeavour to reconcile two, if so be, apparently conflicting documents, and the attempt to explain away a set of statements like those in the Articles as meaning nothing at all; whilst distinct implications like that of conferring the power of the keys in the Ordination Service, and the power of absolution in that for the Visitation of the Sick, are wholly ignored, though clergymen have to express their concurrence in them, and though they are more directly opposed to the author's theory than any of the statements in the Articles to which he pays exclusive attention. Such is the author's attempt to exhibit the Articles of Religion and the law of the Church of England as liberal and flexible. He appears to have some misgiving as to the success of the undertaking, and comes forward as the advocate of the relaxation of subscription, considering that the total abolition of the Articles is for the present impracticable. He considers, however, that they are not successful in the direction in which he would be most glad for them to be effective, viz. in excluding Roman doctrine. It is evident, he says, that the act of signature to the Thirty-nine Articles contributes *nothing* to the exclusion from the Church of Romish views. The premises by which this extravagantly exaggerated conclusion is sustained will be thought scarcely adequate to the purpose: 'for, as it is, opinions and practices prevail among some of the clergy which are extremely distasteful to the generality of the people, by reason of their Romish character.'

We have said that it did not appear to form part of the author's plan to explain the Articles, and that the dissertation upon them is only an episode in an essay which concerns the National Church. The object of the dissertation is to show

the best method in which the National Church can go on from its present imperfect state to one of greater perfection; and in defect of the abolition of Articles, which the people of England would resist, lest the barriers between the National Church and the encroachments of the Church of Rome might be weakened, the object of Mr. Wilson is to suggest that at least the test of subscription to them on the part of the clergy be abolished, and so the laity and clergy be placed upon an equal footing of liberty of thought and action.

We had hoped to have comprised our notice of this volume in a single article, but we have neither time nor space to do so. We hope to recur to the subject in our next number, and shall then endeavour to expose some of the glaring fallacies with which these essays abound. Meanwhile, it has been thought advisable to let our readers know what is the nature of the last great effort of Rationalism in this country. Perhaps they will think with us, that such dishonesty is not likely to make much impression upon candid and fair minds. Probably also they will share our conviction, that such lamentable weakness of intellect and poverty of theological learning will not seem very attractive to our young aspirants after intellectual distinction. The tone of these essays is not openly, but it is formally, an abandonment of Christianity. Let us hope that its authors will soon be brought to a sense of the hypocrisy of continuing to be teachers in a Church, all of whose fundamental doctrines they disapprove and disbelieve.

Thus far this paper had been written and was intended for publication in our last number. An accident which occurred at the last moment prevented its appearance, and it has been thought desirable to leave it unaltered and continue our notice of the remaining essays in this volume, at the risk of inflicting an unusually long article upon our readers.

There are two of these essays which strike us as being quite out of place in the companionship in which they appear. We mean Dr. Temple's account of the Education of the World, and Mr. Pattison's strictures on the tendencies of religious thought in England during the eighteenth century. We call them out of place because we do not detect in them any direct attack upon miracle or prophecy; they neither attempt to show that the Old Testament is altogether incredible, nor that the New Testament must be explained away to suit the prejudices or meet the claims of the philosophy of the nineteenth century. Neither do they, for the most part, contain statements such as would substantiate a charge of dishonesty against their writers for holding their present positions in the Church of England.

With regard to the other clerical writers, we repeat that we have never met with so flagrant a case of dishonesty within the pale of the Church of England; and it is worth while to call attention to this point. Those who are old enough to remember the burst of indignation which followed the publication of the last of the Tracts for the Times, and the condemnation of the opinions advocated in the 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' together with the persecution of their author on the score of dishonest subscription to formularies, may well be astonished at the turn which events have taken. Not twenty years have elapsed from the time when an attempt to show that the Thirty-nine Articles were intended to condemn the practices rather than the doctrines of Rome, roused a controversy, the most important in its consequences of any that have convulsed the Church of England since the Restoration. And now we witness the publication of a volume, six of the writers of which are clergymen, which denies that the Articles have any sense at all in which they need bind the consciences of their subscribers, which refuses credit to a miracle however well authenticated, which resolves all prophecy into human sagacity, which denies the inspiration of Apostles and Evangelists, and which criticises their opinions as if they were entitled to no more credit than those of any other profane author of the period, and which impugns either directly or by implication all the fundamental doctrines of the Church of England. Not only has this volume appeared without a disclaimer from either of the Universities in which the writers occupy prominent places, without the smallest notice on the part of any Bishop to whose jurisdiction some of the writers are amenable, but it has run its career of six months, passed through two editions, and been favourably noticed by more than one periodical, and, as far as we know, been met with no sign of disapproval excepting from the *Christian Observer*, the organ of a party fast hastening to decay, and utterly incapable of meeting the objections or even appreciating the difficulties suggested from the side of unbelief.

The two essays of which we are now speaking do not, we repeat, come under the same imputation which lies so heavily upon the rest. They stand apart and must be classed by themselves; but having so classed them as distinguished from the other five, we must add that the two appear to us to have no other quality in common beyond that negative one, the praise of which we have already assigned them, of not containing any direct attack on the Christian Revelation in general or Christian doctrines in particular. Dr. Temple's is a very weak production, whereas Mr. Pattison has given us a most masterly analysis of



the course of religious thought from the Revolution to the first publication of the Tracts for the Times. This essay is a very remarkable specimen both of extensive research and logical thought. It is singularly interesting, and contains a really valuable addition to the literature of the day. The author is well known as one of those persons whose opinions on theological subjects have been entirely changed, and perhaps few persons could have written such an essay but those who from an Anglican point of view have first despised and then ignored the theology of the eighteenth century, and afterwards, having ceased to be interested in the theology, have come to regard with curiosity the historical connexion of the literature and theology of the one century with the productions of that which immediately followed it. Anglicans very naturally despise a century which on the showing of all parties produced nothing great either morally or intellectually, an age in which zeal and earnestness, depth and reality, were all but unknown, and they of course have turned their thoughts away from a period notorious for disgusting licentiousness of morals and laxity of religious faith. Perhaps no works contributed so much to disseminate this dislike of the eighteenth century as the pamphlets and treatises written by the authors of the Tracts for the Times, and no readers would have so fully appreciated the fact or have been so disinclined to venture on the study of the phenomenon itself as the school of Dr. Newman, of which Mr. Pattison was an acknowledged and somewhat prominent disciple. Accordingly Mr. Pattison has all the advantages of past position and circumstances for understanding his subject; and his very abandonment of his position, coupled with the appearance of standing aloof from all schools of theology, has led him to investigate the pretensions of writers for whom he has begun to feel a reactionary interest. Yet with the exception of a few passages which indicate a contemptuous view not only of Anglican theology, but of all the religious teaching of the day, the essay is remarkably calm and unprejudiced in its tone. There is no other summary of that part of the literature of the eighteenth century which bears upon religious subjects in which so much information is to be found, or which will enable the Churchman to form so true an estimate of this dark portion of the history of the Church of England. And it is under this view that we purpose to say a few words about it, though it may seem somewhat irrelevant to the main purpose of this paper.

Mr. Pattison starts with the fact so familiar to all who are acquainted with the theological movement of the last thirty years, that the *catenæ* alleged by the High Church party in defence of their own position and as proving an uninterrupted

succession of doctrines which were often at that time considered novelties in the Church of England, and really alien to her system, uniformly omit nearly a century, from about 1740 to 1833. The representation, if not strictly true, is certainly near enough for us not to have any desire to gainsay the statement. The extension of the limits of the period by a few years, and the omission of one or two names like those of Bishop Butler, of Jones of Nayland, and of the apostolic Wilson, makes no real difference in the fact which must be admitted—that a system of doctrine which, emanating from the Tracts for the Times, has in much of its outline become the received doctrine of most educated persons among the clergy, can scarcely be found at all during the latter half of the last century. We have always thought that too much weight was assigned to these *catenæ*; but the opinions of most of our writers, as well as the judgments given in courts of law and the arguments alleged there, seem to lay stress upon the fact that a doctrine has been all along held, as evidence that it had a right to be held still. Churchmen, however, seem to think less of this argument than they used to do, and undoubtedly it has stood in good service to the opposite party, especially in the Gorham controversy. However, it will not be denied that the peculiar doctrines, as they have often been considered, of the Tracts for the Times cannot shelter themselves under the authority of the eighteenth century. Probably no school of the present day would care much for the support of the times of the first three Georges, and none could establish any considerable amount of agreement between their teaching and that of at least the first half of the century. Yet it is no unprofitable task to trace the connexion between the thoughts of any given age and that which succeeded it, though the latter may have mainly sprung out of the former by virtue of a reaction. And though entirely dissenting from the views which certain passages pretty plainly indicate Mr. Pattison to hold, we must express our obligations to him for a very lucid and concise historical account of the freethinkers and their opponents. It appears that Bishops and Deans of the period were the controversialists on the side of the Church. We fear the Church would fare badly if it depended on the same class of dignitaries for its preservation from the assaults of rationalism and infidelity in the present day.

Mr. Pattison divides the century at the middle, which for all practical purposes is accurate enough, in order to distinguish the prevailing tone of the first from that of the latter half. He dates the commencement of the period from the publication of Locke's 'Reasonableness of Christianity,' a title which he justly observes may be said to have been the solitary thesis of Christian

theology in England for the greater part of a century. Adopting Cave's style of nomenclature, he calls this century the *Seculum Rationalisticum*. And the distinction we have already adverted to between the character of the writings of the former and the latter half of the century may be briefly summed up as follows:—that the first half was occupied with the general proof that there was nothing in the contents of revelation which was not agreeable to reason; whilst the latter part of this period concerned itself with the subject of external evidences. Mr. Pattison is of opinion that one of these schools was the logical as well as the historical consequent of the other; the contents having been shown to be credible on the score of their being reasonable, the next step naturally was to endeavour to substantiate the facts alleged. Now if the reception of the truths of revelation depended only on the speculative faculty and had nothing to do with the state of the heart and affections, a position which as far as we can see represents this author's view of the matter, this would undoubtedly be the natural course of the argument, though even on that supposition we see no necessity for the precedence in point of time of the defence of the credibility of revelation in general. Most people in point of fact would have proceeded the other way, and fortified their position first, by the study of the evidences, and then have gone on to the defence of the outworks. But Mr. Pattison's sympathies are wholly on the side of the 'Reasonableness of Christianity.' He appears entirely to ignore the fact that the reception of truth is mainly dependent upon the moral state of the recipient; and conceiving that the defenders of revelation against the Deists had rather the best of the argument, the consequence of which was that the Deists had ceased to exist after the middle of the century, he represents the clergy as having no longer any antagonists of this class to deal with, and so proceeding in the natural course of things to the subject of evidences. This error of ignoring the connexion of faith with the state of the heart and the affections, appears here for the first time explicitly, and it may be well to observe that it gives its tone to the whole of the essay. The truth of the sequence of the study of the evidences upon the conclusion of the Deistical controversy was simply this. The divines of the earlier half of the eighteenth century had conceded everything mysterious in revelation when they admitted that reason was a sufficient guide; there was literally therefore no subject of theology properly so called for the clergy to write about, and they expended all their energies on the preliminary question as to the evidences in favour of Christianity, and perhaps in many cases suggested more difficulties than they solved. It could scarcely be otherwise when the issue was made to rest upon each person's uneducated

reason. Nevertheless such books as Addison's did more good than harm. Religion had been reduced to a level where it scarcely interfered at all with the wishes and desires of the more respectable part of the community, and people having no particular temptation to doubt or disbelief were content to accept what appeared to them irrefragable proofs of a comfortable form of religion; and so it passed current in society in general, that there was nothing that could be alleged in the way of reason against so reasonable a Christianity.

It is but natural that Mr. Pattison should estimate highly the writers of this century. Not only is there a silent reaction in his mind towards a system which he considers he has been taught unjustly to depreciate, but the results which they seem to him to arrive at legitimately must appear to him much more valuable than they would do, if he had a deeper appreciation of the truths which exclusively belong to revelation. He appears to us to be in the unhappy position of a man who has let go his hold upon one system without adopting another in its place. He writes like a person who is fully aware of the necessity of religion to mankind, but who is unable to choose for himself any communion with which to cast in his lot. He considers the writings of this period as chiefly serviceable in showing what common sense can and what it cannot do in theological matters.

We should have preferred expressing our conclusion as follows:—that the chief advantage to be derived from the historical study of English history of the eighteenth century consists in the information it gives us as to how little the most unexceptionable arguments of reason and common sense can affect the hearts and lives of people. Moreover, Mr. Pattison overrates the amount of what he calls the truths of natural morality. Has he ever considered that pride is the deadliest of all sins, and that natural morality, with its overweening estimate of the dignity of human nature and its entirely ignoring its actual state of sinfulness, can scarcely construct an argument in favour of humility? In another respect he under-rates what can be effected by the argument in favour of revelation. He considers that, upon the whole, the defence is better than the attack; that there are, so to say, three chances for revelation and only two against.<sup>1</sup> But here Mr. Pattison again misses the point of the argument, simply because the matter is so entirely a matter of intellect with him. He does

---

<sup>1</sup> How came the writer to express the meaning of the author of Tract No. 85, quoting, we suppose, from memory, in such unphilosophical language as the following: 'that there are three chances to one for revelation and only two against it'?

not care to distinguish between the direct and the indirect value of an argument. Of course in a case where there were three favourable and two unfavourable chances, every person with intelligence enough to understand the case, supposing there were no interference of inherent inclination, &c. would choose that which gave him most probability of success; yet there are but few instances, perhaps, where people are guided by the reasonable consideration, yet it may be of the last importance to show on which side even a small balance of probability lies, not so much for the object of influencing one in doubt as to which he shall choose, as for the indirect effect such knowledge exerts over the minds of those who have already chosen. There are few people, probably, who are accustomed to weigh evidence and to combat objections, who are not at times painfully sensible of the temptation to disbelief, and we believe most could bear witness to the sustaining power of the thought that eventually the mere intellectual difficulties of unbelief would appear greater than those of faith.

Again, we are sorry to see Mr. Pattison quoting with approbation the coarse and vulgar dictum of Mr. Maurice. 'It is a *reductio ad absurdum*,' he says, 'of common-sense philosophy, of home-baked theology, when we find that the result of the whole is that it is safer to believe in a God, lest if there should happen to be one He might send us to hell for denying his existence.' It is difficult to understand how it is that writers of ordinary intelligence are guilty of such palpable fallacies. The insinuations in the above statement seem extremely disingenuous, and we do not know how to rescue them from the charge of wilful misrepresentation except at the expense of the writer's understanding. If the argument implied in the above passage is of any force at all, it ought to mean that there is no conceivable amount of evidence for the truth of revelation that amounts to more than this, that the probability of its truth is slightly greater than that of its falsehood. Surely there is nothing so very absurd in the supposition that revelation should propose itself to mankind for adoption on the ground that if they would weigh the *prima facie* evidence of its claims, they would find them possessed of some small degree of probability, premising that greater degrees of light should gradually dawn upon those who followed the little light they had. But it is a convenient fallacy to represent the conclusion of a preliminary inquiry as identical with the results arrived at, after going through the whole of the science. It is the same kind of absurdity as it would be to compare the state of the learner's belief, after reading the introductory chapter to a treatise on physical astronomy, with the appreciation of the

subject which we would have gained by reading and mastering the whole of the treatise. This then is the fallacy contained in the words '*the result of the whole.*' The conclusion of the sentence which comes from Mr. Maurice's essays, viz. 'it is 'safer to believe in a God, lest if there should happen to be 'one, He might send us to hell for denying his existence,' is entirely off the point, and has been added, we suppose, for the sake of representing in stronger colours the '*reductio ad absurdum* of common-sense philosophy, of home-baked 'theology.' And the expression is particularly uncalled for if, as we suppose, we may take it for granted that Mr. Pattison's belief as to a future punishment is entirely identical with that of Mr. Maurice and Mr. Mill, from both of whom he quotes expressions on the subject which are nearly equivalent to each other. We have noticed the expression for the sake of saying a few words on the fallacious mode of reasoning adopted by all these sceptical writers, and apparently by Mr. Pattison amongst their number. The favourite mode of conducting the attack upon the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment is by representing it as if it were the sole motive to good, held out by those who believe it; and with superficial thinkers, it carries weight to represent this form of belief as tending to foster a selfish style of morality, just as if virtue were a mere selfish calculation of the chances of life, or as if, as it has been expressed, it were the height of virtue to be rightly selfish. The view is in reality intimately connected with the line adopted by all writers of the latitudinarian school; viz. the ignoring the fact that character is at all concerned in preparing the recipient for the faith, or in confirming him in it after he has adopted it; and it is eminently unphilosophical to isolate this doctrine from the other doctrines of the faith with which it is intimately connected, as if there ever could have been a single individual in any stage of his religious life wholly influenced by this to the exclusion of the other doctrines of the Christian faith. This ignoring of the influence of right conduct upon right faith, exhibits itself in the impatience with which all these writers receive any allusion to the various kinds of immorality which have associated themselves with different heresies, or the decline in strictness of life which has been witnessed in individuals who have fallen from the true faith. It is very easy to call those who insist upon this obvious truth uncharitable; moreover, these are circumstances where it is almost impossible to lay stress upon it; but it is manifest that if it is a truth, it ought to be insisted on, and probably there is no doctrine of the Church which is more eagerly assailed, no view more eagerly adopted than its denial by persons whose mode of life would lead them



to wish that it should be false. Mr. Pattison truly observes that the divines of the Hanoverian school had in a manner precluded themselves from the advantages of this truth; they had, as it were, challenged people on the score of reason, and therefore had no right to turn upon those who were unconvinced by their reasonable considerations, with the accusation of moral culpability. It was not that they were wrong in bringing the charge, but only inconsistent, for they had started from the theory of the reasonableness of Christianity. Mr. Pattison observes that the assertion that speculative unbelief is the consequence of a bad heart is a poor controversial shift as levelled against an individual opponent. We do not wish to defend the policy of the argument as used towards an individual, but it must never be forgotten that the statement is true. Mr. Pattison has evidently a decided antipathy, not only to the use of the argument, but he faintly impugns the truth of the proposition on which it is founded. He alleges that many of the Deists were men of worth, and that probably of none of them is anything known which would make them worse men than the average of their class of life. But upon the whole, such an allegation is worth very little, when it is remembered that people are what they are very much upon prudential considerations, and that the average respectable character is pretty much the result of a conflict of interests, clashing with each other, and a prudential calculation of consequences. Deists and infidels possessed of the resources of intellectual power will often appear more respectable characters than professors of Christianity of an inferior intellectual calibre, who continue in the faith in which they have been brought up.

We will part from Mr. Pattison with the concluding remark, that one great fault in his essay is that it is pointless. As an historical investigation, as we have already said, it puts together an immense mass of useful information. It contains an able writer's appreciation of the theology of an age which is past. It suggests what the author does not appear willing to enter upon himself—a similar analysis of the theology of the present age. This will, no doubt, be attempted in a future generation, when the controversies which convulse the present times will appear in a light in which none of the disputants can yet view them. Mr. Pattison is not unaware of the difficulties of the task which he proposes.

The conclusion of his essay is as follows:—

‘Such appears to be the past history of the Theory of Belief in the Church of England. Whoever would take the religious literature of the present day as a whole, and endeavour to make out clearly on what basis Revelation is supposed by it to rest, whether on authority, on the Inward Light, on Reason, on self-evidencing Scripture, or on the combination of the

four or some of them, and in what proportions, would probably find that he had undertaken a perplexing but not altogether profitless inquiry.'—*Essays and Reviews*, p. 329.

We come next to Mr. Jowett's, which is at once the most important and the most dangerous essay in the series. Its professed subject is *The Interpretation of Scripture*. Those who are acquainted with this author's *Commentary upon the Epistles to the Romans and Thessalonians* will hardly be surprised at the tone of the essay. It is thoroughly characteristic of its writer. It would be impossible to describe it in a few words. Any question that should be asked about it by an inquirer would have to be answered with some reservation. Is it deep or shallow? Is it earnest or trifling? Is it harsh or tender? Does it exhibit knowledge or ignorance of human nature? To what school of thought does it belong? Is the author satisfied with his position, and does he think that his views will really make way in the world? Is the author learned or unlearned? logical or illogical, &c.? All these questions and many more may be asked, and will be answered in many ways, and with many modifications, according to the prejudices of the answerer, the care he has taken in understanding the essay and the state of mind of the essayist—his acquaintance with his other works, or his knowledge of the position and circumstances of the writer.

There is much that bears the appearance of candour, fairness, and moderation; there are thoughtful suggestions thrown out, and there is a melancholy tenderness of turn about parts of the essay that will exercise a peculiar fascination over youthful minds, as well as over many who have passed the season of youth, without acquiring any definite convictions on religious subjects. On the other hand, those who can see farther will not be slow to detect the symptoms of bitterness and impatience and annoyance, with which the essay is disfigured; and few persons who have lived through the eventful thirty years which have witnessed so marked a change in the character of the clergy and the doctrines preached by them, will fail to discover that Mr. Jowett is still gradually drifting away from all definiteness of faith, that he is quite aware that he will never live to see his views extensively popular in the Church of England, and that he is by no means satisfied of the truth of all the ideas which, as he imagines, form part of his present creed. One would not willingly speak with severity of a man for whom one must entertain so much pity. He reminds us more, perhaps, than any other individual who is known in the literary world of the saying that one individual is incommensurate with another. And after making all the allowance that can be made for idiosyncrasy, perhaps we shall not be far wrong in

saying that Mr. Jowett's inconsistencies are owing chiefly to his having lived so much apart from the world, and employing his really acute powers of observation within a narrow sphere, and to the limited range of reading to which he appears to have confined himself. These considerations will in part account for a tone of indirect sarcasm against those who differ from him, as if they totally ignored all the difficulties of the present generation, and his undisguised contempt for the narrow-mindedness of those who are shocked at hearing conclusions which they know are contrary to the faith, though they may not be able logically to expose the fallacy of the arguments on which they rest.

We proceed to notice the essay on the Interpretation of Scripture. It is divided into five sections—the first of which consists of a description of the state of the case as regards the manner in which Scripture is understood by different parties, who bring different prejudices to bear upon its interpretation. Everybody is familiar with the tone of confidence with which disputants of all classes make their appeal to the Sacred Text, and with the surprise that is often expressed at an opponent's inability to see what appears perfectly plain to his antagonist.

Both the learned and unlearned, especially amongst Protestants, have been accustomed to press the letter of Scripture far beyond what it will bear, and preconceived opinions have in many cases led to the ignoring or explaining away of certain texts which did not easily fall in with the views to be maintained; whilst exaggerated importance has been attached to others which fitted the case better, and which have sometimes been erroneously interpreted to make them prove what it is intended they shall prove.

It seems to us that the only possible inference to be drawn from such a state of things is, that as it is impossible for people to come unbiassed to the reading of Scripture, the interest of instructors is to take care that their pupils or children, as the case may be, should come to it imbued with true notions, or at least what they suppose to be true. It is the argument which Catholicism urges with such powerful weight against the principle of Protestantism. It is the point, too, in which the theory and practice of Protestants are irreconcilable with each other. They profess their belief in the ability of each person to find his creed for himself in Scripture, but they are wise enough in practice not to allow any one to run the risk of missing what they think the true creed. And so all sects possess their catechisms and short forms which are to be the guides, at least as to the fundamentals and outlines of the faith. However, be the true inference what it may, the state of things above described undeniably exists; and before suggesting any remedy for it,

Mr. Jowett gives an extremely clear elucidation of it, the only objection to which that we have to urge is, that it is founded upon a false analogy, and therefore represents the case untruly.

This phenomenon, viz. that Scripture is interpreted in so many different ways, Mr. Jowett says, is so familiar and yet so extraordinary, that it requires an effort of thought to appreciate its true nature. Accordingly, he proceeds to assign it its true value by a comparison instituted between the New Testament on the one hand, and the works of an ordinary Greek writer, as, for instance, Sophocles or Plato, on the other; and the point of the comparison is to show how absurd it is to stick to a *textus receptus* in the one case, because of the undeniable absurdity of it in the other. He seems to be urging a plea for the application of criticism to the text of the Greek Testament, seeing no reason why it should not be treated in the same manner as the text of an ordinary Greek writer, where the antiquity, the relative value, the independence, &c. of certain manuscripts are used to decide in favour of or against certain readings which appear in printed editions, and which, in some cases, have acquired an undue importance because they have been so commonly received. Even in this part of the subject, where we are not really at issue with Mr. Jowett, as far as his conclusions are concerned, he is guilty of very great misrepresentation. There may be many who do not rate the critic's art as highly as Mr. Jowett does, and amongst this number we must be content to represent ourselves. There may be some, perhaps, who are to a fault indifferent about the subject; but we really do not know where to look for the antagonists whom Mr. Jowett's imagination conjures up, who are unwilling to allow the weight of learned criticism to be applied to the elucidating and settling of the text of the New Testament. And yet we ask, what is there but a systematic opposition to all criticism on the part of a body who are supposed to be worth attacking, that could have induced Mr. Jowett to write as follows?

'Up to the year 1550 or 1624, alterations, often proceeding on no principle, have been introduced into the text, but now a stand is made. An edition which appeared at the latter of the two dates just mentioned is invested with authority; this authorised text is a *pièce de résistance* against innovation. Many reasons are given why it is better to have bad readings to which the world is accustomed than good ones, which are novel and strange; why the later manuscripts of Plato and Sophocles are often to be preferred to earlier ones; why it is useless to remove imperfections where perfect accuracy is not to be attained. A fear of disturbing the critical canons which have come down from former ages is, however, suspected to be one reason for the opposition. And custom and prejudice, and the nicety of the subject, and all the arguments which are intelligible to the many, against the truth which is intelligible only to the few, are thrown into the scale to preserve the works of Plato or Sophocles as nearly as possible in the received text.'—P. 335.

Now, as it is certain that the text of the New Testament must be settled by manuscript authority, much in the same way as that of any common Greek author, inasmuch as it has come down to us by successive transcripts precisely in the same way with all other ancient works; and as there is no body of individuals, either within or without the Church, entitled to any consideration who deny this, or object to true readings being substituted for false ones, when they have been undeniably substantiated, the author might as well have left this part of the parallel alone. Nay, he had better have done so if he had any regard for his reputation as a scholar and a critic, or a logician. The only way in which we can at all account for his perverse imagination, about the resistance that certain parties are supposed to make to critical emendations of the text of the New Testament, except on the score of entire ignorance of the views and feelings of those with whom he is now brought into immediate contact, is that he has confused in his own mind the opposition that has been made in various quarters and from different points of view to a revised English version, with a supposed aversion to any interference with the Elzevir text of 1624. We take leave to add, that in our opinion, Mr. Jowett has considerably damaged any reputation for critical scholarship which he may have been supposed to possess, by his sneer against the preference for later manuscripts over earlier. He is Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, yet evidently knows nothing whatever about collating Greek manuscripts. If he had, he would never have hazarded an opinion which is liable to be contradicted by almost every one who has ever edited a Greek author from manuscripts. There is probably scarcely an author or part of an author, of which there are more than ten existing manuscripts, in which it will not be found that at least one more recent transcript is of more value than an earlier one, as representing a better family of manuscripts. The dispensing of the Crown patronage by the present ministry has been in too many cases reprehensible, and we scarcely think they will gain much credit for their recent appointments to the Regius Professorships at the two Universities.

The reader will at once see that all this protest on the part of Mr. Jowett against the supposed impugning of the criticism of the New Testament is entirely beside the point. His subject is the Interpretation of Scripture, but in making a representation of the absurdity of the many different modes of interpreting Scripture which may be found in the world, by comparing the case with the supposed similar state of things as regards Plato or Sophocles, there is a sufficient close analogy between this

case and the totally distinct case of the application of criticism to the settling the text of a profane and a sacred writer respectively, to pass it off as part of the same argument; and, granting the fact alleged, which, as we have said, is not to be granted, Mr. Jowett's case appears to be materially strengthened. We do not, of course, accuse him of intentional dishonesty. It is only to be regretted that Mr. Jowett, in common with all the other writers of the latitudinarian school, are almost entirely destitute of logical accuracy.

From criticism, which is neither Mr. Jowett's *forte* nor his subject, we proceed to interpretation; and our next extract, whatever be its defects, has at least the merit of being to the point, which the last was not.

'Leaving the text,' he says, 'we proceed to interpret and translate. The meaning of Greek words is known with tolerable certainty, and the grammar of the Greek language has been minutely analysed both in ancient and modern times. Yet the interpretation of Sophocles is tentative and uncertain: it seems to vary from age to age; to some the great tragedian has appeared to embody in his choruses certain theological or moral ideas of his own age or country; there are others who find there an allegory of the Christian religion or of the history of modern Europe. Several schools of critics have commented on his works: to the Englishman he has presented one meaning, to the Frenchman another, to the German a third; the interpretations have also differed with the philosophical systems which the interpreters espoused. To one the same words have appeared to bear a moral, to another a symbolical meaning; a third is determined wholly by the authority of old commentators; whilst there is a disposition to condemn the scholar who seeks to interpret Sophocles from himself only, and with reference to the ideas and beliefs of the age in which he lived. And the error of such an one is attributed not only to some intellectual, but even to a moral obliquity, which prevents his seeing the true meaning.

'It would be tedious to follow into details the absurdity which has been supposed. By such methods it would be truly said that Sophocles or Plato may be made to mean anything. It would seem as if some *Novum Organum* were needed to lay down rules of interpretation for ancient literature. Still one other supposition has to be introduced, which will appear perhaps more extravagant than any which have preceded. Conceive then that these modes of interpreting Sophocles had existed for ages; that great institutions and interests had become interwoven with them, and in some degree even the honour of nations and churches—is it too much to say that in such a case they would be changed with difficulty, and that they would continue to be maintained long after critics and philosophers had seen that they were indefensible?'—P. 336.

And such is the caricature in which Mr. Jowett shows up the absurdity of the various interpretations of Scripture current in the nineteenth century, and the different methods upon which the work of interpretation has been and is conducted. The criticism has all the advantage of being clear, and distinct, and pointed. There is no possibility of mistaking what the author means. He is indirectly stating the case of the interpretation of Scripture, merely substituting the word Sophocles, with



occasional additions, when it can safely be added, of Plato, for Scripture. We will therefore take the liberty of resubstituting the word Scripture in the above extract in place of Sophocles, and let us see what its implications and insinuations amount to.

That the meaning of Scripture is uncertain; that there are persons who consider it to contain a history of modern Europe; that different meanings are attached to its expressions by Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans as such; that those who understand Scripture as bearing a moral meaning are a totally distinct class from those who attribute to it a symbolical meaning; that people who interpret Scripture from itself, and with reference to the ideas of the times in which its different books were written, are looked upon with suspicion, and the errors into which they fall attributed to a moral obliquity which prevents their seeing the true meaning.

Now this is the very least that Mr. Jowett can be supposed to mean, and we ask any candid person to consider whether this fairly represents the state of the case, or whether it is not an exaggeration, which bears so remote a resemblance to the truth, that it is difficult to discover what the truth is which is so misrepresented. Surely it is absurd to say there are national interpretations of Scripture, or that those who insist upon symbolical interpretations and spiritual meanings are indifferent to the moral or the literal meaning of Scripture. And assuredly there is no school, even amongst the distinctions of opinion prevalent in this country, that objects to an interpretation of Scripture by itself. And whatever be the occasions on which moral obliquity is, whether rightly or wrongly, imputed, we do not remember ever having seen this charge brought either against the practice of explaining Scripture by means of itself, or against individuals who adopt the practice.

So much for misrepresentation of the facts; let us now proceed to the fairness of the comparison. And here we can have no wish to deny the fact of the immense variety of the interpretations of Scripture, and the irreconcilable nature of the schemes of religion which have been reared upon its interpretation. We trust we shall not be tempted to underrate the importance of so plain and undeniable a fact, because we consider Mr. Jowett to have enormously overstated it. Mr. Jowett would, in our opinion, have been far more usefully occupied, if, instead of employing his time in exaggerating a fact, he had taken the trouble to inquire into its cause. Is it after all so very strange that Sophocles should be easy to understand, and parts of Scripture so very difficult? It may help us to appreciate the difference between the two if we for a moment consider Plato as occupying an intermediate place

between them. The comparison of Sophocles and his interpreters on the one hand, with Plato and his commentators on the other, will supply us with a tolerably striking contrast as regards uniformity of explanation. Whilst no competent scholar is at a loss to comprehend the meaning both of the tragedies as a whole, and of the parts of them in particular; what an endless amount of dissertation has there been both upon the subject of the Platonic ideas in general, and the meaning of certain dialogues or portions of dialogues in his works. Let it be considered, then, that Sophocles wrote tragedies, the plots of which are for the most part founded upon historical and pre-historical, and mythical stories, for the amusement, and, perhaps, for the edification of an Athenian audience, and that Plato was the founder of a school of philosophy, which for two thousand years has moulded the forms which moral and political science have taken, has exerted a considerable influence in preparing the way for Christianity, and directing the course of Christian thought, (an influence by the way which writers of this school are far from underrating,) has had the remarkable fortune of meeting with a set of admirers who go the length of considering him inspired, and forming an antagonist school, who look upon him as a visionary and enthusiast. It is not difficult to account for so very remarkable a difference of fortune in the fate of the two writers. Surely we should not be wrong in attributing it in part to the interest of the subjects handled, in part to the genius of the writer, and partly, perhaps, to the adaptation of the writer's tone of mind to his subject—when we see a single author's works, some thousands of years after he is dead, made the battle-field of controversy. Surely it is at once recognised that in such a subject the feelings and the interests of humanity are deeply concerned, that some mighty issues are involved in the questions discussed, that no mere temporary interests are at stake, but that the matter under discussion is no less than those eternal and unchangeable truths which have all along been deemed to have their existence in one Almighty Being, and which, as continuously, have been impugned by those who do not wish to believe them.

It is unnecessary for us to draw out at length either the comparison or the contrast between the philosophical works of Plato and the Revelation which the Sacred Scriptures profess to contain. The argument, to show that there must of necessity have arisen a great variety of modes of interpretation, would gain strength from probably every difference that could be pointed out between the circumstances of the two. The result would be that even on the Protestant ground of the appeal to Scripture, the comparison between the case of the

sacred writings and the tragedies of a Greek poet would appear wholly irrelevant; whilst the absurdity of the comparison would be intensely aggravated by the additional consideration that Scripture was written not with the view of teaching people their faith, but for the purpose of confirming them in the faith which they had learned from another source. If this additional circumstance be taken into consideration, it will appear no very extraordinary result if any amount of error should have sprung up from the reading of Scripture by persons who have been entirely neglectful of the caution which Scripture itself supplies to readers not already initiated into the Christian faith. Let it be added to this that Scripture makes its special appeal to the teachable and humble, and has for the most part been interpreted wrongly by the self-righteous and the pretenders to intellectual power. We need not, therefore, stop to discuss with Mr. Jowett the amount of variation in the interpretation of Scripture. Perhaps, if every action in justification of which passages of Holy Writ have been at one time or another alleged be taken into consideration, it might be found that there is scarcely any crime of which man can be guilty which has not been defended in this way. It would be of course absurd to allege extreme instances of this kind. We must suppose Mr. Jowett to be speaking of interpretations such as have found favour with classes of men—such as are usually met with, not wholly wanting in common sense, or entirely degraded in morals. It would not have suited his purpose to distinguish the cases of misinterpretation as applied to doctrinal subjects, and mistakes as to the meaning of history or prophecy.

Any such distinction would be wholly unmeaning on Mr. Jowett's hypothesis. Churchmen at once see that this would be suggestive of the difference of principle between Catholicism and Protestantism. It would involve the settlement of the question, whether it was not intended that people should come to the interpretation of Scripture with a prejudice, the prejudice, namely, of belief in the creeds of the Christian Church. This antecedent question appears to have been set aside altogether, the author taking it for granted that it is better to read Scripture without any such bias, and endeavour to elicit its meaning as best the reader may be able. He seems to take it for granted that all people can be fair and candid, and unprejudiced, and he is sanguine enough to believe, in spite of the unpromising appearance of so many centuries' disputation about the meaning and interpretation of Scripture, that a time will come when there will be a uniform system of interpretation in which all men shall quietly and naturally acquiesce. The only evidence that we can find adduced in favour of the probability of this

wondrous change in the opinions of the world, consists in a discovery of the author's, that for the first time in the history of Christianity there is an approximation to agreement amongst German critics as to the meaning of certain hitherto doubtful prophecies.

Mr. Jowett does not, indeed, ignore the fact that people have hitherto been prejudiced. He is content to admit that what has as yet stood in the way of a rational interpretation of Scripture is chiefly the desire of people to wrest its meaning to support the tenets of a party. We are not inclined, under existing circumstances, to think there is much approach to unanimity of opinion amongst Protestants, nor much appearance of diminution of that party spirit which we join with Mr. Jowett in deploring. So long as there exist heretical opinions and bodies of schismatics, so long as the Church itself is divided into Eastern and Western, and this latter subdivided into separate Churches, each branch protesting against the supposed errors of the others, we see no likelihood of agreement as to the interpretation of Scripture as to those points which have been thought important enough to warrant a severance of communion. Nor do we think Mr. Jowett's *exposé* of the absurdity of such variations will effect much in the direction in which he is sanguine enough to think things are moving; whilst the comparison which he further institutes between the case we have been considering, and the supposed influence of the same or similar prejudices, if brought to bear upon subjects of mathematics or natural science, shows how entirely ignorant he is of the methods respectively pursued in pure mathematics, and in the physical sciences which have been brought under the dominion of mathematics. It seems to him a sufficient exposure of the prejudices against which he wages battle, to show how absurd would be their operation in the field of science. 'In natural science,' he says, 'it is felt to be useless to build on assumptions: in history we look with suspicion on *à priori* ideas of what ought to have been. In mathematics, when a step is wrong we pull down the whole house, until we reach the point at which the error is discovered. But in theology it is otherwise; there the tendency has been to conceal the unsoundness of the foundation under the fairness and loftiness of the superstructure.'

Such a flimsy argument might pass muster, perhaps, with readers who have a prejudice in favour of Mr. Jowett, but will hardly, we think, affect any who are acquainted in any degree with the processes of science. Surely it is but throwing dust in people's eyes to compare, not theology, but that part of the theology which is concerned with the right interpretation of Scripture, with pure science. What resemblance is there between

a deductive system of reasoning, such, for instance, as is contained in Euclid's *Elements of Geometry*, and the proper method of understanding such a volume as that of *Inspiration*? Again, what does Mr. Jowett mean by saying that 'in natural science it is felt to be useless to build on assumptions'? Now the exact contradictory of this is the truth; natural sciences are wholly built upon assumptions, and they approach more or less nearly to perfection, according as the assumption can bear being confronted with a greater or less number of facts, a more or less complicated system of phenomena. Had Mr. Jowett stated that in natural science an hypothesis is allowed to stand till it is disproved, he would have been saying what was true, but what would not have suited his purpose so well. Nay, it is not merely in the discoveries of natural science that this method is pursued, but even in teaching it. No teacher would for a moment think of allowing a pupil to commence a treatise on plane astronomy with a protest against believing what he thinks contradictory to his senses. Such an experiment might, perhaps, be tried on a given individual, for the purpose of discovering how long the learner would be in finding his way back to the right path, but would hardly be tried a second time. The comparison we are now making, it will be seen, applies to the interpretation of the Bible, as to fundamental points, such as the Articles of the Christian faith. With regard to other prejudices which interfere with the true understanding of Scripture, as, for instance, the inveterate obstinacy with which some people refuse to open their eyes to the plainest evidence of geological science, or the pertinacious resistance to the proof that a certain favourite text is a mere interpolation of a transcriber, and the like, we do not deny that there is a great deal of unreasonableness exhibited by persons who ought to have known better how to treat such allegations, though even in these cases there is much that commends itself to our sympathy, in the fears which many entertain of arguments which they cannot follow, and which seem to be undermining the faith in which they have been brought up. But Mr. Jowett cannot bear prejudice in any shape, and it is the feeling that these prejudices cannot be swept away by argument that makes him write in a tone of irritation against those who are influenced by them, and also is the cause of a great deal of unfair misrepresentation.

This unfairness is specially evinced in the accumulation of accusations brought against those whom he is attacking, some of which are true, some false, some to the point, some wholly irrelevant, some are more or less connected with his subject, and have more or less introduction of extraneous matter, and some have truth and error mixed in various proportions. People who

read hastily and superficially, as most people in the present day do, are content to see a general allegation apply to one of the particulars enumerated under it, and do not stop to inquire whether it will include the rest; and thus it requires only the inclination to believe that the writer is correct, to induce the reader to accept a good deal of statement as if it were so much argument. This is a favourite artifice with Mr. Jowett. We do not mean that he designedly adopts it, but only that his tone of thought is so loose and inaccurate that he cannot help falling into it. As an instance of what we mean, take the following passage from the conclusion of the first part of the essay, which, as we have said, contains the statement of his case. It is an illustration of the manner in which the writer says principles have imperceptibly grown up which have overridden facts.

‘No one would interpret Scripture as many do, but for certain previous suppositions with which we come to the perusal of it. There can be no error in the Word of God, therefore the discrepancies in the Books of Kings and Chronicles are only apparent, or may be attributed to differences in the copies. It is a thousand times more likely that the interpreter should err than the inspired writer. For a like reason, the failure of a prophecy is never admitted in spite of Scripture and of history; the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the prophet is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date. The accuracy of the Old Testament is measured, not by the standard of primeval history, but of a modern critical one, which, contrary to all probability, is supposed to be attained; this arbitrary standard once assumed, it becomes a point of honour or of faith to defend every name, date, place, which occurs. Or to take another class of questions, it is said that “the various theories of the origin of the three first Gospels are all equally unknown to the Holy Catholic Church,” or, as another writer of a different school expresses himself, they tend to sap the inspiration of the New Testament. Again, the language in which our Saviour speaks of his own union with the Father is interpreted by the language of the Creeds. Those who remonstrate against double senses, allegorical interpretations, forced reconcilements, find themselves met by a sort of pre-supposition that God speaks not as man speaks. The limitation of the human faculties is confusedly appealed to as a reason for abstaining from investigations which are quite within their limits. The suspicion of Deism, or perhaps of Atheism, awaits inquiry. By such fears a good man refuses to be influenced: a philosophical mind is apt to cast them aside with too much bitterness. Whether those conditions of thought are the traditions of the Church, or the opinions of the religious world, Catholic or Protestant, makes no difference. They are inconsistent with the freedom of the truth and the moral character of the Gospel.’—P. 342.

This passage is, perhaps, the best we could have selected in illustration of Mr. Jowett’s style of mixing together in one attack a number of positions and a variety of schools of thought. It serves also as a fair indication of the author’s isolated position in the theological world. It exhibits him as entirely at variance with all parties who profess adherence to the Church of



England as distinguished from bodies of Nonconformists. It indicates plainly that whatever interpretation of Scripture he may be pleased to adopt or recommend, he is not disposed to trust it for the facts of history nor the predictions of prophecy. It seems to imply a denial of any sense in the language of Holy Writ beyond that which is on the surface, and to contain a sort of protest against any allegorical meanings whilst forbidding attempts to reconcile discrepancies of fact or statement.

We cannot undertake to notice all the points to which allusion is made. But it seems just worth while to call attention to the absurd *petitio principii* involved in the assertion that the fact of the name of Cyrus occurring in the prophecy of Isaiah proves the verse in which it occurs to be of later date. Where there are distinct allusions to events subsequent to the supposed writer's time, no doubt a tolerably complete argument for the forgery of the work in which they occur may be established; but surely a book which professes to be prophetic has claims to be measured by a different standard from one which clumsily and accidentally brings in later events which do not belong to its subject. The genuineness of the first verse of Isaiah's forty-fifth chapter may perhaps be controverted, but we submit that it is no argument against it that it is prophetic.

Prophecy is only one way in which the inspired volume differs from other books. This difference, however, is not admitted by Mr. Jowett; and accordingly, on proceeding in the second part of this essay 'to examine some of these prior questions which lie in the way of a reasonable criticism,' the question which first presents itself is naturally that of inspiration. From this second part, which is much the longest portion of the essay, it might have been expected that the author would have given us some positive idea of what inspiration is, for he seems to admit that Scripture is in some sense inspired. The reader, however, will be disappointed at finding that after devoting seven pages to protesting against every reasonable and unreasonable form of belief in inspiration, Mr. Jowett diverges from his subject in order to notice the insufficiency of Scripture texts to prove the doctrines and practices in support of which they are adduced. He admits the practices in certain cases, *e.g.* Infant Baptism and Episcopal Government, to have sufficient grounds, but does not tell us what those grounds are. With regard to doctrines, we infer that Mr. Jowett does not think it much matters what form is held. All that we gather is that he considers, and in this opinion we entirely concur with him, that inspiration is incapable of being defined in an exact manner; beyond this, all is wrapped up in the utmost vagueness of expression, or else is palpably erroneous. What, for instance, can be the meaning

of telling us that inspiration is reconcileable with the mixed good and evil of the characters of the Old Testament? What has the idea of the style and character and origin of a writing to do with the moral character of people who are mentioned in the writing? And if the following statement is not false, we should like to be informed what it means: 'There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of preaching and teaching which they daily exercised;' and why should it be added to this that they do not anywhere lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity'?

In Mr. Jowett's tirade against inspiration, for in truth it is nothing else, we have mixed up in hopeless confusion the character of the writers as independent of their writings, the character and contents of the writings themselves, and the character of the persons whose history or actions are delineated in the writings. And the fact that S. Paul was not omniscient, and did not know when the coming of Christ should be, is brought in evidence against the inspiration of his epistles; whilst the assertion that one evangelist was an eye-witness, and another set forth a declaration of what he had heard from eye-witnesses, seems pressed into the same service. It is no wonder that Mr. Jowett should think so disparagingly of inspiration, when we find it asserted that it is a fact, which we infer from the study of Scripture,—that it can be no other than that idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it, because there is no other source to which we can turn for information. This fact embraces the Book of Esther and the Song of Solomon. We should be glad to know what length of time should be devoted to the study of these books in order to establish their inspiration. The fact, again, is reconcileable with the attribution to the Divine Being of actions at variance with that higher revelation which He has given of Himself in the Gospel; it is consistent with imperfect and opposite views of truth, with variations of fact and inaccuracies of language. Mr. Jowett finds fault with believers in inspiration for agreeing in a term to which they attach indefinite varieties of meaning. He is far more inconsistent in that he adopts the term, and, as far as we can see, attaches no meaning at all to it. If he had rejected the term as well as the thing, he would have written much more intelligibly; but we suppose it would have been going a little too fast for English rationalism to follow.

Of the two considerations which Mr. Jowett offers us for removing the difficulties of the idea of inspiration, the first in effect clears away the difficulty by pointing out that inspira-

tion means the idea which we gather of Scripture from Scripture itself; a view of inspiration which accommodates itself to the different calibre of each reader, to the different tone of mind in which he may happen to be, and to the different aspects in which different books (the Book of Esther, for instance, and the Revelation of S. John) may present themselves to his mind. The second consideration touches on the delicate question of the relations of Science and Revelation. Again Mr. Jowett finds no difficulty in solving the question. He notices the two cases of scientific conclusions, such as those of astronomical truths which are established, and others, such as those of geological and philological science, which may hereafter be proved, and argues that it is not worth while to fight a losing battle on these latter, on the ground which seems to him to have been won from revelation by the former. Mr. Jowett is here so vague that we can scarcely follow him, but he appears to mean that the results of science are certain, and the statements of Scripture must give way, but he does not go the length of one of his fellow-essayists in therefore throwing overboard the whole Old Testament, as being neither wholly true nor otherwise of any value since the coming of Christ and the New Dispensation. On the contrary, he is anxious to preserve the idea of the Old Testament as a whole, after making due allowance for all blunders of fact and principle which it sanctions. He adopts the Old Testament as containing valuable historical records mixed up with much matter that clashes with profane history, and which may therefore be received, and presenting useful hints for the conduct of life, which may be used with advantage by those who approve of them, or to whose minds they commend themselves. The reconciliation of Scripture and Revelation is too large a subject to be entered upon here, but we may be permitted to refer the reader to some remarks made on this subject in a recent number of this Review.<sup>1</sup> Those who object to the mode in which physical truths are spoken of in Scripture, may fairly be called upon to substitute other language which shall express the same without anticipating those discoveries of science which God has intended shall be won by patient and toilsome investigation. But we must confess our inability to follow Mr. Jowett's bold assumption, which is made in the teeth of those who scoff at all idea of revelation and inspiration, on the very ground of these alleged mistakes of Scripture. He tells us that 'there is no need of elaborate reconcilements of revelation and science; they reconcile themselves the moment any scientific truth is distinctly ascertained.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Christian Remembrancer*, No. CIV. for April, 1859.

'As the idea of nature enlarges, the idea of revelation also enlarges.' And extending the same train of thought to the domain of history, he informs us that historical truth must not be tortured into agreement with Scripture, nor tied down to its chronology. 'Again, the idea of inspiration must expand and take them in.' Mr. Jowett does not care to provide a remedy for the equally obvious inference that many minds have drawn and many more will draw, 'As the idea of nature enlarges, the field of revelation contracts; as the records of history illuminate mankind, the idea of inspiration evaporates.'

And here Mr. Jowett leaves the subject of inspiration, the larger portion of the remainder of the section being taken up with elucidating the mode of accommodation which people who profess to go by Scripture adopt in interpreting it, according to the present usages of society, and in adjusting it to the doctrines of the creeds. The description of the manner in which Scripture has been misinterpreted, parts of it wholly ignored, and undue stress laid upon other parts, by fanatics and others, might probably have been enlarged to a great extent, and yet the author lays far too great weight upon these instances: his view undoubtedly makes out a case against the Protestant notion of the self-sufficiency of the Bible, which may be fairly left to the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society to answer as best they may be able. But what is specially worthy of note is the enumeration given by Mr. Jowett of passages of Scripture, in which there has been a neglect, and, in some instances, a misinterpretation of words which are not in harmony with the spirit of the age. We have no objection to any one insisting on the marked difference between the practice of mankind in regard to heaping up riches, and the declaration of our Lord, that it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven; but Mr. Jowett is not entitled to press into his service, for the sake of illustrating the difficulties of interpretation, the folly of which maniacs, fanatics, Quakers, and the like, have been guilty, in imitating the recorded practice of the prophets of the Old Dispensation. It may, perhaps, be a fair question, with what limitations such texts as 'Go sell all that thou hast,' or, 'If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also,' are to be interpreted. It may also admit of difference of opinion how far the stern denunciations of the prophet about cedar and vermilion, or the cry against those that lay field to field, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth, are suitable for imitation in the nineteenth century; but the questions are certainly distinct ones, and it indicates a very illogical state of mind to confuse them as Mr. Jowett does.

With regard to the objections alleged against that 'temper of accommodation' which 'shows itself in the attempt to adapt the truths of Scripture to the doctrines of the Creeds,' we have a graver charge to bring against Mr. Jowett. The Protestant theory would no doubt, if it were consistent, object to all creeds and formularies; the utmost limit that could logically be conceded to it being a short summary of faith couched in the exact words of Scripture. As, however, in teaching, it is quite impossible for the teacher not to influence the pupil towards the view which he himself holds, the theory of each individual finding his faith for himself in the Bible, which is Mr. Jowett's theory, is quite impracticable. We suppose Mr. Jowett knows that, and is not sanguine enough to hope entirely to do away with prejudices on the part of all learners, and that the utmost he expects to effect is, to induce intellectual readers to divest themselves, as far as they possibly can, of prejudice. The inability of people to act upon this advice to any great extent will probably render such a theory much less extensively mischievous than might at first sight be supposed. But Mr. Jowett has here, in point of logic, the advantage of the narrow-minded school to whose opinions he might be thought to be approximating. The so-called Evangelical school at least sincerely believe that all that they profess, including the Nicene distinction of *ὁμοούσιον* from *ὁμοιούσιον*, may be satisfactorily proved from Scripture. Now Mr. Jowett, though he guards himself against the charge of considering the expressions of the Creed false, yet thinks them an unsuitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture. This disadvantage he considers them to possess in common with every other precise or definite rule of faith, as for example the Unitarian. The principal argument adduced for this belief on Mr. Jowett's part is as follows: 'If the occurrence of the phraseology of the Nicene age in a verse of the Epistles would detect the spuriousness of the verse in which it was found, how can the Nicene or Athanasian Creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture?' Putting Scripture on precisely the same level with Sophocles, which was the position from which Mr. Jowett appeared to start, the argument would be conclusive; under the view of Scripture containing a revelation from God of which the Church is commissioned to be the keeper, the witness, and the interpreter, the argument entirely vanishes.

The very least then that we can suppose Mr. Jowett to mean here, is that it is unfortunate that the Nicene formulary was ever adopted. He does not place it in exactly the same category with the rule of faith of the Unitarian body. He thinks their view positively erroneous, because it will not bear being

confronted with the exact words of S. John: 'The Word was God,' and 'I and the Father are one.' But he adduces these texts in this relation, with the view of pointing out 'the error 'of introducing into the interpretation of Scripture the notions 'of a later age, which is common alike to us and them.'

We are glad to be able to include Mr. Jowett amongst the number of those who still believe in the Godhead of Jesus Christ, and remark that the following passage is written only with the view of showing up the absurdity of the expressions, and not of dissenting from the doctrines of the Nicene Creed. But for the single respectful mention of the Creeds as being an 'acknowledged part of Christianity, standing in a close relation 'to the words of Christ and his Apostles, and making as near 'an approach to a simple and Scriptural rule of faith as any 'heterodox formula,' and as containing expressions, of which the germs are sufficiently apparent in Scripture, with which, therefore, it would not be wise to contrast them; there is nothing in the essay that would lead us to suppose that its author believed the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church. Whether we are overstating the case shall be judged by the reader from Mr. Jowett's own words:—

'To attribute to S. Paul or the Twelve the abstract notion of Christian truth which afterwards sprang up in the Catholic Church is the same sort of anachronism as to attribute to them a system of philosophy. It is the same error as to attribute to Homer the more developed principles of Aristotle and Plato. Many persons who have no difficulty in tracing the growth of institutions, yet seem to fail in recognising the more subtle progress of an idea. It is hard to imagine the absence of conceptions with which we are familiar; to go back to the germ of what we know only in maturity; to give up what has grown to us and become a part of our minds. In the present case, however, the development is not difficult to prove. The statements of Scripture are unaccountable if we deny it; the silence of Scripture is equally unaccountable. Absorbed as St. Paul was in the person of Christ with an intensity of faith and love, of which in modern days, and at this distance of time, we can scarcely form a conception—high as he raised the dignity of his Lord above all things in heaven and earth—looking to him as the Creator of all things, and the head of quick and dead, he does not speak of him as equal to the Father, or of one substance with the Father. Much of the language of the Epistles (passages for example such as Romans i. 2; Philippians ii. 6) would lose their meaning if distributed in alternate clauses between our Lord's humanity and divinity. Still greater difficulties would be introduced into the Gospels by the attempt to identify<sup>1</sup> them with the Creeds. We should have to suppose that He was and was not tempted; that when He prayed to His Father He prayed also to Himself; that He knew and did not know of that hour of which He as well as the angels were ignorant. How could He have said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" or, "Father, if it be possible let this cup

<sup>1</sup> We quote Mr. Jowett's own words. We do not pretend to be able to give any account of his language. The process of identification is certainly singular if the Gospel and Creeds can be subjected to it.



pass from me?" How could he have doubted whether when the Son cometh he shall find faith upon the earth? These simple and touching words have to be taken out of their natural meaning and connexion to be made the theme of apologetic discourses, if we insist on reconciling them with the distinctions of later ages.'—P. 354.

The latter part of this quotation seems to us unintelligible, except on the supposition that Mr. Jowett believes there is actual contradiction between the narratives of Scripture and the doctrines of the Church. It would be unfair not to give the author all the advantage to which his avowal of adherence to the Creeds of Christendom entitles him. We must, therefore, limit our accusation against him within the narrowest compass that is possible. His vague and dreamy mind, wrapt up in what he calls an idea, does not see what other people call logical inconsistencies. To expose him for being guilty of a contradiction in terms would probably have no effect upon him, and to charge him with disbelief in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds would probably astonish him as much as the being called on to sign the Articles in proof that he was still a believer in the Atonement. But the fact that he gives occasion to so much scandal, and is so commonly misunderstood—if, indeed, it be misunderstanding—ought to make him more cautious as to his modes of expression. Extreme inaccuracy in the use of words, and confusion of thought as regards statements, characterise the whole essay, and offer the best defence that can be made of the writer's orthodoxy as regards the most elementary and fundamental truths of the Christian religion. We do not know whether this is the more striking characteristic of his writings, or the profound ignorance which he exhibits in regard to the religious opinions of the Catholic world, and generally of those who differ from him; or, again, of things which are actually going on and patent to the observation of every one. Take for instance the evidence brought to show that the present age, in a part of its intellectual state, has grown out of the mystical methods of the early fathers, viz. 'No one will now seek to find hidden meanings in the scarlet thread of Rahab, or the number of Abraham's followers, or in the little circumstance mentioned after the resurrection of the Saviour, that S. Peter was the first to enter the sepulchre.' Has Mr. Jowett never heard of Mr. Neale's lately published volume on the mystical explanation of the Psalms, or the elaborate commentary on the Gospel narrative in Mr. Isaac Williams' volumes? If the reading of such works be confined to a party in the Church, we should certainly infer the party to be a large one—large enough we do not say to disprove Mr. Jowett's careless assertion that no one seeks hidden meanings, but to show the reckless style

of writing in which this author indulges—large enough, perhaps, to suggest that even the modified form of expression adopted in the next paragraph, viz. ‘To most educated persons’ ‘in the nineteenth century, these applications of Scripture’ ‘appear foolish’—is very far from representing the true state of the case.

Take for instance again the following misrepresentation of the prevailing style of sermons on certain texts, such as the parable of the good Samaritan, or the falling of the tower of Siloam. He thinks the obvious lesson to be learned from the parable, viz. that our neighbour may perhaps be of a different religion from ourselves, is not commonly insisted upon in sermons, and that the improvement usually made of the event of the falling of the tower of Siloam is different from the obvious lesson in the Gospel. We suppose this means that preachers make use of any sudden visitation more in the way of denouncing God’s judgment against sinners than in exhorting their hearers to exercise a charitable judgment on the sufferers. Other similar instances are adduced; and we are bound to say that our hearing of sermons has been very different from Mr. Jowett’s, and if he will take the trouble to read the sermons upon these texts which have been published within these last twenty years, he will probably alter his opinion. Again, it betrays great ignorance of the meaning of terms used in theology, as well as of the opinions of theologians, to speak of such expressions as ‘invincible ignorance’ and ‘uncovenanted mercies’ as being invented by persons ‘half reluctant to give up, yet afraid to’ ‘maintain the advantage of denying salvation to those who are’ *‘extra palum ecclesiæ.’*

There is a tacit assumption in Mr. Jowett’s mind, of which he never loses sight, that orthodox people do not really believe what they profess. Mr. Jowett is impatient with them for teaching what has been taught them, and expects them to see difficulties in the same light in which they are presented to himself. And when he finds they are not affected by them as he is, he gets angry with them, and accuses them of saying what they do not think. This is the real meaning of another passage in which he is most unjust to those who, whether rightly or wrongly, skilfully or clumsily, attempt a reconciliation of the Mosaic cosmogony with modern geological discovery, or other parts of the Old Testament with other branches of science. He is distinguishing the case of well-ascertained laws of nature and probable presumptions of physical laws, which remain yet to be established, and observes that ‘it is not worth while to fight on this debateable ground a’ ‘losing battle, in the hope that a generation will pass away

'before we sound a last retreat.' Now what else is this but an insinuation that those who maintain what they believe to be the truths of revelation, whether in opposition to, or in the endeavour to reconcile them with, probable discoveries of modern science, are dishonestly upholding a theory which may last their time, but which they suspect is rotten at the core?

It is but fair to Mr. Jowett to say that in all these covert accusations his tone is very different from the arrogant and scornful language of Dr. Rowland Williams towards those he is attacking. Mr. Jowett's tone is not that of contempt, but of surprise, that men of saintly lives should so often seem to be indifferent to truth. The commonness of the fault, instead of setting him upon inquiry as to its cause, only seems to increase the petulant irritation under which he views it; an irritation which seems to take a personal turn, as if he felt that he were especially the victim who had suffered from it. From the conclusion of his essay, it might have been thought that Churchmen were the dominant party in this country, and that he and his friends are looked upon with suspicion, as running counter to the feelings of religious parties. But his isolated position never seems for one moment to raise a doubt in his mind as to whether it may not be possible that others may be in the right and he himself in the wrong. There is a melancholy tone, not unmixed with bitterness, about the concluding paragraphs of his essay; but he consoles himself, and offers the consolation to him who shall adopt the same isolated course of action, that 'he who bears a part in it may feel a confidence which no popular caresses or religious sympathy could inspire, that he has, by a Divine help, been enabled to plant his foot somewhere beyond the waves of time. He may depart hence before the natural term, worn out with intellectual toil; regarded with suspicion by many of his contemporaries; yet not without a sure hope that the love of truth which men of saintly lives often seem to slight, is nevertheless accepted before God' (p. 433).

We have made this digression from the subject of the interpretation of Scripture in order to notice and dismiss, once for all, any allusion to the character of the writer. It may seem ungracious to touch upon this point at all, but was perhaps necessary to enable the reader to appreciate better the point of view from which the essay was composed.

We return now to the enumeration of the difficulties which beset the interpretation of Scripture.

The next difficulty turns upon the settlement of the question whether Scripture has one, and one only, true meaning, or whether it has many; whether the mystical and allegorical interpretations of the fathers are to be admitted, or whether

this method is to be restricted, as Protestants generally have restricted it, to the double sense of prophecy, and the typical anticipation of the Gospel in the Law. This question is, as the author justly observes, part of the more general question as to the relation of the Old to the New Testament, and involves a fourth question, mooted by Mr. Jowett, as to the interpretations of the Old Testament that occur in the New, whether given by our Lord himself or the Evangelists and *other* writers. We should have preferred using the natural term, *inspired writers*, which it is almost difficult to avoid using; but the use of it would have begged the whole question, and we have purposely abstained from writing it, because in the relation in which it would have appeared, it would have been quite out of place. These three latter questions could only arise on the supposition of the first question of inspiration being settled, and judgment being given against it. It is true there is no formal disavowal of belief in inspiration in this essay. Rather, on the contrary, the author appears to cling to the word, but it is entirely explained away; neither can we gather any other idea of it than that the Bible, interpreted on Mr. Jowett's principles, 'will be a spirit and not a letter,' and that there is a certain inexhaustible and infinite character about the sacred writings, which will impress itself upon the intellectual reader after a careful study of all its separate parts, when perhaps there will suddenly burst upon him the idea of the whole, just as to the intelligent observer of nature, the harmony of a scene, long perhaps gazed on, but not understood, will in an instant unfold itself. But the question of inspiration being once settled in favour of its existence, the other questions cease to be questions of principle, and the only difficulty they would present would be one of detail. And here we come upon another of Mr. Jowett's inconsistencies; he does not profess to attempt the determination of these questions, but only to point out what questions those are which he conceives must be determined 'before any real progress can be made, or any agreement arrived at, in the interpretation of Scripture.' Yet, practically, he treats the question of inspiration as settled, as likewise he does the second question which he has suggested, as to the one or many meanings of Scripture. We have no wish to find fault with Mr. Jowett for stating his opinions, whether on this or any other subject, which he has a perfect right to do; but a writer, we think, can hardly expect much confidence from his readers when he tells them in one place (p. 370) that he makes no attempt to determine questions, one of which he proceeds to determine before he has written ten pages more. Thus we are told:—

'First it may be laid down that Scripture has one meaning—the meaning which it had to the mind of the prophet or evangelist who first uttered or wrote to the hearers, or readers who first received it. Another view may be easier or more familiar to us, seeming to receive a light and interest from the circumstances of our own age. But such accommodation of the text must be laid aside by the interpreter whose business is to place himself as nearly as possible in the position of the sacred writer. That is no easy task—to call up the inner and outer life of the contemporaries of our Saviour; to follow the abrupt and involved utterance of St. Paul or one of the old Prophets; to trace the meaning of words when language first became Christian,' &c. (p. 378).

And again at the end of the third section :

'Of what has been said this is the sum :—That Scripture like other books has one meaning, which is to be gathered from itself, without reference to the adaptations of Fathers or Divines; and without regard to *a priori* notions about its nature and origin. It is to be interpreted like other books, with attention to the character of its authors, and the prevailing state of civilisation and knowledge; with allowance for peculiarities of style, and language, and modes of thought and figures of speech. Yet not without a sense that as we read there grows upon us the witness of God in the world, anticipating in a rude and primitive age the truth that was to be, shining more and more unto the perfect day in the life of Christ, which again is reflected from different points of view in the teaching of His Apostles.' (p. 404).

If Mr. Jowett's view is correct it is fortunate for the coming generation that he has been able to settle some of the many questions which are preliminary to a right understanding of Scripture. Some other critic in the next generation may perhaps be successful in deciding a few more of them, and thus prepare the way for that golden age, as yet seen only in the far distance, when there shall no longer be any disputes about the meaning of Scripture, and all readers shall acquiesce in the one true idea which it has taken so many centuries to develop and expand. We confess we are not so sanguine.

When an Essayist is inconsistent with himself, it is but a small crime to accuse him of disagreeing with his brother Essayists. The topic of the interpretation of Scripture, and the subject of miracles, are both important. We suppose Mr. Jowett is scarcely yet prepared to indorse Professor Powell's denial of the possibility of a miracle in the world of matter; but the Savilian Professor appears to us to have a much stronger case to urge against Mr. Jowett for his neglect of the precepts of the Inductive Philosophy. Unless there is some good reason to be assigned to the contrary, so many centuries of dispute about Scripture may be pronounced to be good evidence as to the probability of the continuance of controversy. Whether this evidence will not become overpowering when the causes which lead to this misinterpretation are taken into consideration, we will leave with our readers to decide. Again, there would be some plausibility

in the argument, if a sceptic taking this volume for his basis should conclude that the time is not far distant when it will be agreed that Scripture, as a whole, has no meaning at all; and when, consequently, Christianity shall have ceased altogether, or represent the religious faith of an insignificant portion of the world. Miracles have been shown to be entirely inconsistent with the very idea of the Inductive Philosophy. Prophecies have been explained away on the ground that plain prophecy is history, and obscure prophecy is not prophecy at all. The idea of inspiration has evaporated in the crucible of criticism; the progress of science and the researches of history have overthrown the statements of the Old, and thrown grave doubts over the narrative of the New Testament. Add to this, that Scripture ever implies the two states of good and evil—individuals being in favour with God, or out of His favour, an opposition which is one of ideas only, and which is not realised in fact, as experience shows us; not that there are two classes of men animated by two opposing principles, but an infinite number of classes or individuals from the lowest depths of misery and sin to the highest perfection of which human nature is capable, the best not wholly good, the worst not entirely evil. Taking all these things into consideration, the sceptic's argument would be at least intelligible. We confess our utter inability to comprehend the intermediate position in which our Essayists stand.

We should extend this article to too great a length if we were to follow Mr. Jowett minutely through the remaining sections of this Essay. Neither is there any necessity for our doing so. In the third section, which is marked § 2, as if it were meant for a sub-section of the previous portion (the arrangement and numbering of the divisions of the Essay being as confused as its contents are), we have amongst many irrelevant remarks an apology for what the author thinks 'may be censured as a wanton exposure of the difficulties of Scripture.' Such apology is wholly out of place. Though Mr. Jowett's inveterate prejudices will scarcely allow him to believe it, the difficulties which he mentions are known to most persons, and are not ignored by the learned. It is mere childish petulance in Mr. Jowett to accuse people, in the wholesale manner in which he indulges, of concealment of difficulties, including in his sweeping charge a majority of the clergy throughout the world, and the half-sceptical, half-conservative instincts of every layman, as well as individual interests, which he says are in favour of this course, a course which he characterizes as alike opposed to the freedom of the truth, and to that 'honesty which will ever be found to be the best policy.' We have no objection whatever to Mr. Jowett's



making allusion to such difficulties which, probably all, or most of them, are known to every reader he is likely to have; we can only express our wonder at the intense folly of an author who insists upon difficulties and makes scarcely any attempt at their solution. If Mr. Jowett had offered any remedy for the case which he suggested, we could forgive him the ridiculous exaggeration of describing the Christian minister as almost powerless in the hands of his opponents; as one who can give no true answer to the mechanic or artizan, who has either discovered by his mother-wit, or who retails at second-hand the objections of critics, because he is unable to look at things as they truly are.

The second apology which Mr. Jowett offers for appearing to disparage the early Fathers—the Roman Catholic mystical writers, with whom he seems to delight in associating the Swiss and German reformers—and Nonconformist divines, was equally unnecessary. He exhibits to the full as much respect for them as any one would have expected of him.

The next section contains some suggestive remarks on the language and criticism, the grammatical structure, and the logical character of the language of the New Testament; but we have no space to follow him through the many questions indicated; we must, therefore, content ourselves with protesting against the transparent fallacy implied in the words—people ‘are not aware how little words affect the nature of things.’ The context implies that the author means ‘people’s ideas of the nature of things,’ and not the nature of things itself, which, of course, would remain the same whatever words were invented to describe them. Such errors of expression are trifling in comparison with the truth which the words are meant to convey; but we have an old-fashioned prejudice in favour of accuracy of expression, and are not disposed to believe in exactness of thought where it is wanting. If Mr. Jowett, however, means what we suppose him to mean, the history of the world both profane and sacred might, we should think, in most of its pages, be brought to bear evidence to the falsity of his assertion. He must be very ignorant of controversy who does not know what immense influence on life and character has been exerted by a dispute which subsequent ages have seen to be a mere dispute about terms, and which, perhaps, might have been pronounced so at the time by one who could observe events with sagacity and comment upon them dispassionately.

The concluding sections of the Essay insist upon the separation of the interpretation from the application of Scripture. It is of the last importance to Mr. Jowett’s theory that a sharp line of demarcation should be drawn between the two. Yet he

appears himself to admit that none such can be drawn; the interpretations of the Old Testament given in the New are, however, classed with adaptations; and he is very jealous of any applications of Scripture to the circumstances of life, on the ground that they may be unreal. Yet some such applications he seems to think necessary, and though they may hold up a standard beyond what can be reached, they are, he says, at least better than 'mere prudential or economical lessons, lectures on health, or sanitary improvement.' He has a glimpse of truth when he speaks of the 'analogy of faith' being a kind of safeguard against untrue interpretations or applications; but what the analogy of faith is, or where it is to be found, except in Scripture as it is to be hereafter interpreted by the new light of criticism, does not appear. The author makes no allusion to the Apostles' Creed; but it is not unnatural, considering the effect it has had on the interpretation of Scripture, that he should endorse with only a qualifying 'perhaps' the assertion of an eminent English prelate that the decision of the Council of Nice was 'the greatest misfortune' that ever befel the Christian world.' The Apostles' Creed, probably, he would not demur to, on the ground of its being a summary of the teaching of the New Testament, and so nearly contemporary with it as to contain nearly the same forms of expression, and the same ideas; yet, considering the different senses which have been assigned to some of its clauses by those who adopt them, it is scarcely likely that he alludes to the Creed at all. It seems to us more probable that the 'analogy of faith' is quoted in a casual way, with scarcely any distinct idea attached to it by the writer. As far as words go, we can quite agree with him. So long as the analogy of faith is preserved, there can be nothing to fear from criticism, which in its own province has shown its value of late years by throwing considerable light upon the sacred text. We can have no wish to disparage it, when it does not go beyond its proper limits.

Mr. Jowett himself observes that when the Bible has been interpreted by all the light of present and future criticism, it will still remain unlike all other books. What makes it unlike all other books is that it alone, of all books, contains the revelation which God has made to His creatures. But if it is indeed different from all other books, it is no such extraordinary circumstance that it should require additional aids and cautions in its interpretation. Still, with all the assistance that criticism is likely to give, and all the methods it may bring to bear upon the interpretation of Scripture, we are not so simple as to suppose that it will eventuate in uniting even Protestants in one body; we do not

see those signs which the author thinks he can discern, that the distinctions of theology are beginning to fade away. There is, indeed, a present lull in the controversy both on Baptism and the Holy Eucharist which contrasts strangely with the excitement which prevailed on these subjects during the period when the two trials of Mr. Gorham and the Archdeacon of Taunton were proceeding; but even if indifference to doctrine, within the pale of the Church of England, were the true account of this apparent calm, it would be but a slender basis upon which to found the magnificent edifice of a Catholic Church, agreeing, without doctrines and without faith, to make a crusade against the indifference of the worldly and the immoralities of the wicked. Is Mr. Jowett in entire ignorance of the controversies which show no present symptoms of abatement between the religious bodies of Scotland, or the divisions which exist amongst the Baptists and other bodies of Nonconformists in England? Or can he seriously think that Catholics of the Roman Communion are at all approaching to agreement with his views of things? The conclusion of the Essay is full of the most extravagant expectations, on the possibility of the realization of which the author seems to love to dwell, though he does not appear sanguine in his anticipations of their immediate fulfilment.

The absurdity of schemes of toleration has been often enough argued, and we should have thought sufficiently tested by experience; but the proposal for an union of Christendom based on the interpretation of Scripture by the light of modern criticism, leaving open all such doctrines as can be met with texts of Scripture which seem to contradict them, the rule of religious opinion being allowed to vary 'with the ever varying conditions of the human mind and Christian society,' is the wildest chimera that has ever been seriously proposed for the adoption of Churchmen.

---

ART. V.—*The Day Hours of the Church of England.* London: Masters.

It was the seventeenth Sunday after Trinity, and a glorious autumn afternoon. The fashionable world of Brussels was airing itself in the Rue Royale; the bells of some of the parish churches were sounding for vespers; when the writer of the present article rang—he confesses, with somewhat of a trembling hand,—at the outer door of the Convent of S. Michel, and inquired whether Father Tinnebroek were at home. The answer was in the affirmative; and in another minute he found himself in the Bollandist Library.

It would be unpardonable to commence an article upon the Kalendars of the Church, and not to begin with those who have won themselves an everlasting name in the recording her Fasti. The 'Acta Sanctorum' is a work in which every branch of the Church, Greek, Latin, or Anglican, must take equal interest; nay, and the secular use of which is sufficiently proved by the fact that the Belgian Chambers supply the funds—far beyond the power of any religious house to undertake—as those required for a national work.

We have already seen, in another paper, how the great school of Deventer, originally founded by Geert Groot, became, according to his prophecy, in the third generation a merely learned establishment. But among those who, having been educated by its teachers, clung fast to its original design, the learning of the Church and not the erudition of the world—was Herbert Rosweyd, born at Utrecht, 1569. Seeing the manifold faults of the then existing Hagiologies of Lipomanni and Surius, he determined to devote his life to the publication of a true and critical series of Acts of the Saints. It was in the very heat and agony of the counter-Reformation, when it seemed utterly beyond human foresight to tell whether Germany would become wholly Catholic or wholly Protestant, that this brave-hearted monk brought out his little synopsis. His work, he thought, might be included in seventeen folio volumes: two were to be taken up by the Festivals of our Lord and His Blessed Mother; one in divers dissertations connected with Hagiology; twelve—one for each month—in the Acts themselves; and two in indices and general tables. The post brought a copy of this synopsis

to Bellarmine. 'What!' cried the Cardinal, 'does the man expect to live two hundred years?' Two hundred and fifty years have elapsed since that time, and still Rosweyd's work is continuing, and we can scarcely expect that the present century will see its termination. Thirteen years elapsed before the projector found time to commence his great undertaking. He had a few trifling publications—not more than seven or eight folios, and a dozen octavos—which hindered his beginning it; at length, in 1629, he really set himself to the task, being then in the sixtieth year of his age. 'If God spares me,' he said, 'to the age of seventy-two, I shall have completed my work.' But instead of writing the lives, he was to imitate the deeds, of the Saints. He heard that Bois-le-duc had been captured by the United Provinces, and that a contagious fever had broken out in consequence of the miseries of the siege. He hurried thither, understanding that priests were scarcely to be found in the town; and after ministering for some weeks to plague-stricken men, was himself seized with the fever, and went to his rest on Oct. 5, 1629. It might be said of him, that he was the David to chalk out the plan which a happier Solomon was to execute.

Four years ago we took some pains to visit the little village of Bolland, near Julemont, in Limbourg. It is a thoroughly Belgian hamlet; rich, hedgeless fields, roads that are a series of ruts in summer and quagmires in winter, a poor little Flamboyant church of the worst and rudest character. That village it took us more than half a day to reach, but we thought the time well spent. For here it was that on Aug. 13, 1596, John Van Bolland was born. Rosweyd had collected a vast number of rude materials; these on his death became the property of the Jesuits' Company, of which he himself was a member; and to Bolland, then in the thirty-fourth year of his age, and a priest of the same Company, the materials were intrusted. For seven years he wrought by himself; and he then found it necessary to call in the assistance of Godfrey Henschen. When joined by his new coadjutor, he had finished the whole month of January. Henschen's first work was the life of S. Amandus, for the sixth of February. When he presented that ever memorable biography to his senior, Bolland said, 'I shall re-write every life in my January.' He said it and he did it; an example of Christian humility and literary earnestness which is perhaps unparalleled.

Bollandus might well have been astonished at the new life thus presented to him. Instead of a mere compilation from the one or two mediæval biographies of S. Amandus, Henschen investigated every particular of history connected with his saint;

thoroughly elucidated one of the most obscure questions in the French annals, the three Dagoberts; followed Amandus in all his wanderings; gave a notice of the thirty-seven monasteries which he founded; bringing him to Strasburg, gave a sketch of twenty-three prelates of that place; discussed the details of the Merovingian palace as if he had been born within its precincts; and all this only by way of preface. Then followed the five ancient biographies, one of them till then unpublished; all collated with the best manuscripts, and having various readings; and to conclude there followed different offices and hymns of the saint—the whole taking up eighty-eight folio pages in closely-printed double columns. And in order to direct the eye of the reader, a river of side annotations flowed in the margin, so as in a connected history to form an abbreviation of the text itself.

It was in 1643 that the two volumes of January came into the world; fifteen years more elapsed before February followed. In the meantime, as if almost by inspiration, Bollandus had fixed his eyes on Daniel Papebroch, who thenceforth gave up himself and his whole property, which was considerable, to the work. Bollandus himself laboured at it for thirty-four years; Henschen for forty-six; Papebroch for fifty-five. And with the latter it was that the travels, correspondence, controversies, and persecutions of the Bollandists began. For they would have been unworthy to write the lives, had they not in some degree experienced the sufferings, of the Saints. For the complete formation of the whole agency by means of which every monastery in Europe sent up its own legends, Papebroch may claim the chief praise; and in this sense the verse is true—

Quod Rosweydyus prepararat,  
Quod Bollandus inchoarat,  
Quod Henschenius formarat,  
Perfecit Papebrochius.

Let us describe the present Bollandist Library as we saw it on that Sunday afternoon. There were three not very large rooms, of which the central one contained the greatest treasures and formed the chief workshop. Round the walls, every known biography of a Saint; hundreds of the rarest missals and breviaries, hymnals and martyrologies; glorious folios, bound in covers of half-inch oak; that, backed with hogskin like tortoiseshell, this, knobbed and clasped in brass or silver. Then in the centre of the room a large counter-like erection, serving as a table, but also fitted with drawers, each drawer numbered with one day of the then unfinished Bollandist year, beginning from October 17. When any of the Bollandists happens to



meet with a passage which may be useful in the history of a future Saint, he makes a reference on a separate piece of paper, and puts it into the drawer of the day on which that Saint will occur. Thus we remember that, while we were running over a proof-sheet of the fifty-sixth volume with Father Tinnebroek, a reference to Saint Cecilia occurred. Immediately he took one from the file of papers provided for the purpose, made a reference to the page, and put it into the drawer for Nov. 22. Twenty or thirty years hence the then Bollandists will make use of it.

Nothing can be more interesting than the accounts which remain to us of the various journeys of Henschen and others through different countries of Europe. Thus, in 1660 Henschen and Papebroch left their old master at Cologne, and revelled in the manuscripts and curiosities and traditions of the various German monasteries on their way to Rome. So at Mayence they inquire into the acts of S. Boniface; at Würzburg they procure manuscripts concerning S. Bernardus and S. Bruno; at Bamberg they devote themselves to the history of the empress-widow-virgin, S. Cunegunda. 'At Frankfurt,' writes Henschen, 'we went up to the citadel, where the chief senator gave us excellent wine. In this Lutheran church the Hours are sung very nearly as we sing them. Before the high altar, which has been well restored, a lamp burns; and when fault was found about this with the Senator Facher, and it was called Papistical,—“Oh,” said he, “in twenty years we shall all be Papists.”' So at Augsburg they see the shrine of one who loved much because much had been forgiven her, S. Afra, who, with S. Ulric, is patron of Bavaria. In another place Henschen celebrates in the chasuble of S. Witegisus. At Spire a most apostolic dean entertains them: there are thirty-six silver dishes, with viands to correspond; and they drink success to the Acta in Rhine wine a hundred and twenty years old. Papebroch makes some observations on the poverty of the Church, and teases Henschen by causing him to sleep in a bed which had been for some months occupied by Luther. But Henschen has his revenge in the descent of the Alps, when Papebroch, who had never before seen a mountain, is frightened well-nigh out of his senses, and crouches down in the bottom of the chariot. And so they arrive at Rome, just in time to make acquaintance with the venerable Luke Holstein, librarian to the Vatican, who in his last illness will confess to none but Henschen, and well nigh breathes out his soul in the words *Padre Henschenio*. There they remain nine months, Papebroch often writing from two in the morning till ten at night, without any other interruption than that of saying the Hours. Then we find

them on their return through France. A certain Father Daniel goes with them, who is called the pen of a ready writer, inasmuch as, copying from dictation, he can fill twenty folio pages daily in the smallest of characters. This was one of their many tours; so in like manner, Spain, so Bohemia, so Poland were visited, and their stores exhausted. It was not to be expected that a historical investigation into Hagiology could be carried on without overturning a great many legends, and exposing several pretended Saints. The most dangerous of all the attacks which the Bollandists experienced was that which arose from the Carmelites, whose pretended descent from the prophet Elias our hagiographers had clearly crushed. It cost their learned champion, Janning, ten years' residence at Rome to prevent the condemnation of the whole Acta as heretical. That danger parried, the Spanish Inquisition, in 1695, condemned the work; and whatever efforts were made to procure a reversal of the condemnation, Papebroch died under the cloud. He went to his reward in 1714, and the decree was reversed in 1715.

Under twenty different collaborators the Acta continued from 1643 to the fiftieth volume, which reached the 7th of October, in 1770. In 1773, the order of Jesuits being suppressed, it seemed that the Bollandist labours must also come to an end. But its materials being removed to the Abbey of Caudenburg, five religious of other orders, three Præmonstratensians, a Benedictine, and an Augustinian, feebly carried on three volumes more; and then the storm of the French Revolution destroyed the Abbey, dispersed its materials, and exiled the writers. But of the materials, a certain portion was concealed in the Abbey of Tongerlo; and in 1810 Napoleon decreed that the work should be continued. The minister charged to make a report on the subject, not being acquainted with the secret treasures reserved at Tongerlo, pronounced the scheme impossible. 'Hagiography,' he said, 'is at an end.' But in 1825, William, King of the Netherlands, discovered the long concealed hoards. That monarch sent all the printed books to the Hague, while the invaluable manuscripts were laid up at Brussels. The former could be replaced; the latter could not. The Belgian revolution broke out; King Leopold was recommended to make the Acta a national question. One of the old Bollandists, Cyprian Van de Goor, was still alive, and in 1837, the restored company of the Jesuits re-undertook the labour. On the 8th of May in that year, the Belgian Chambers voted the Acta a national work, and provided funds for its continuance. Five Hagiographers were appointed—Joseph Van de Moere, Joseph Van Hecke, Benjamin Bossue, Victor de Buch, and Antony Tinnebroek, and they, for their part, engaged to bring out a volume

every four years. *Their* first—in reality the fifty-seventh volume—contains one of their master-pieces, the Life of S. Theresa: it was given to De Moere and Tinnebroek, and occupies 600 folio pages. Here they had a glorious revenge over the Carmelites, their ancient persecutors. It is the Bollandists who have raised the most imperishable monument to the glory of the great Carmelite Saint. This volume was published at Brussels in 1845. The last which they have published is the ninth, for October, which takes in the 21st and 22d days of that month. The most curious feature is the Legend of S. Ursula. This is the third volume issued by the new Bollandists.

Our readers must consider this brief account of the Bollandists a preliminary parenthesis—to use an Irishism: but in undertaking to speak of Church Kalendars it would have been unpardonable not to have alluded, in the place of dignity, to the greatest of Kalendars. And now we must speak of the different divisions of Festivals in various branches of the Church, and we will begin with the East.

In the Constantinopolitan Church, Festivals are divided into three classes—Great, Middle, and Little.

Great Festivals are divided into three sections—

1. Easter, which stands by itself.
2. Twelve principal Feasts; namely, Christmas Day, Epiphany, Purification, Annunciation, Palm Sunday, Ascension, Pentecost, Transfiguration, Repose of the Mother of God, Nativity of the Mother of God, Exaltation of the Holy Cross, Presentation of the Mother of God.

3. Festivals called Adodecata, or, in Slavonic, Nedvana-desiatiia, as not being equal in honour to the Twelve. These are: Circumcision, Nativity of S. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, Decollation of S. John Baptist. All these are marked with ⊕.

Festivals of the Second Class are divided into two sections—

1. Those in which the Office is not entirely of the day, but which have at Lauds an additional canon, in honour of the Mother of God. These days are—January 30, SS. Basil, Gregory, and Chrysostom: April 23, S. George; May 6, S. John the Divine; November 13, S. John Chrysostom; Dec. 5, S. Sabbas: Dec. 6, S. Nicolas of Myra. These are marked ⊕.

2. Middle Festivals of the Second Class have the Polyeleos (Psalm cxxxvi.) at Lauds. These are the days of the Apostles, except as above: great doctors or wonder-workers, and certain 'God-bearing' fathers, as S. Simeon Stylites. They are marked +.

3. Little Festivals have two classes.

1. Those which have the Great Doxology (as have all the preceding,) at Lauds, and are called Doxologised Feasts. They are marked .:. in red ink.

2. Those which have not the Doxology: they are marked thus, .:) in black ink.

It is not necessary to dwell at any length on the Armenian Division of Festivals. Briefly, it consists of four classes—

1. Easter and Epiphany. It is well known that the Armenian Church has no such Festival as Christmas.

2. Those which form the remainder of great Festivals in the Orthodox Church, together with the days of S. Gregory the Illuminator, the Apparition of the ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON at Etchmiadzine; the Martyrdom of S. Hripsime; that of S. Gaiane; and perhaps one or two others.

3. This is almost the same as the second Eastern Class; and,

4. As the Third.

But we must remember that the various Saints of the Constantinopolitan Fasti are named, not in the mere formal prose of the west, but each in a stichos of two or more verses; and these usually contain 'a pun, punnet, or pundigriion,' to adopt Southey's classification of paronomasiae. They are to be found in the Menæa, after the Sixth Ode of the Canon for the Day, and before its Menology. But, in the year 1727, it pleased a Leipsic scholar, by name Urban Godfrey Siberus, to make a collection of these stichoi, and to accompany them with a most barbarous Latin version. The book, which is not very common, makes a convenient Breviate of Eastern Saints, for those who are not desirous of going very deeply into the subject.

Little as such punning verses seem to promise, they are frequently not without their beauty. It is difficult, from their very nature, to translate them in a way which should be intelligible to any but to him who can equally well comprehend the original Greek. But, in some instances, such a version may be possible. Let us take an example or two—

CHRIST came that He might kindle fire on earth :  
And in that fire was Xene's heavenly birth. (Jan. 18.)

That Maysimas, in Syrian hymns who sung,  
Now sings with Angels in the Angels' tongue. (Jan. 23.)

Thy *Polycarp*, O WORD, who dies by fire,  
Brings forth *much fruit* to Thee upon the pyre. (Jan. 26.)

The tyrant, Chares, may cut off thy feet :  
But not the less thou hast'st thy LORD to meet. (Jan. 28.)

Amid the sheepcotes Blasius dwelt of old :  
His home is now within the heavenly fold. (Feb. 3.)

Lo! Baptus and Porphyrius yield their life,  
Baptized with purple in the Martyrs' strife. (Feb. 10.)  
Eulogius finds the Monarch of the skies,  
And greets Him with the Martyr's eulogies. (Feb. 13.)  
Not water doth Eudocia,<sup>1</sup> as of yore,  
To Thee, O SAVIOUR!—but her life-blood pour! (Mar. 1.)

This may suffice as a specimen; but many of these compositions are of a yet far inferior kind. That our LORD, for example, was Ruler of the *πόλος*, while He vouchsafed to ride on the *πόλος* (The English reader may conceive the wretchedness of the pun, by a like play on the words *pole* and *foal*.)

We now proceed to the Western arrangement of Feasts.

The Roman classification of Festivals is this:

Double of the First Class.	Double.
Double of the Second.	Semi-double.
Greater Double.	Simple.

The Parisian disposition is as follows:

Annals.	Lesser Doubles.
Greater Solemn.	Semi-doubles.
Lesser Solemn.	Simples.
Greater Doubles.	

Thus adding another class to the Roman.

Of different Mediæval arrangements we may principally notice these:

A. That which prevailed in many early Kalendars of Religious Orders, though afterwards by the same Orders dropped.

Triple.	Lesser Double.
Lesser Triple.	Simple.
Double.	

In which, Triple nearly answered to the Roman Double of the First Class, and Lesser Triple was somewhat more confined than Double of the Second. We have seen this arrangement in early Cistercian, Carthusian, and Præmonstratensian books. One of the most glorious Kalendars we ever saw, at Nantes, which had belonged to Premontre, was thus arranged.

B. Again, and this seems to have been usual in Northern Churches, the following:—

Principale.	Minus Duplex.
Majus Duplex.	IX. Lectionum.

III. Lectionum.

C. And some Kalendars of this kind inserted Triplex between the Principale and the Majus Duplex.

D. A favourite German division was as follows (thus we have seen books of Cologne, Ratisbon, Würzburg, Freiburg, Magdeburg, Salzburg, and others):—

<sup>1</sup> The woman of Samaria.

Summum (others call it Dominicale).  
Duplex.

Simplex IX. Lectionum.  
Officium.

Collecta.

The two latter titles meaning that on the day specified by them in the one case, Collect, Introit, and Post Communion, in the other Collect alone, were *of* the Festival.

Before we proceed, we cannot but express our surprise that no work has ever yet been devoted to a Classification of Mediæval Missals and Breviaries after their families. Now that every part of Europe is so easily accessible, ten or fifteen years' labour might accomplish that which, in former centuries, could hardly have been brought to pass by the devotion of a life.

Now, taking the Parisian and Roman Kalendars as our model, let us examine which Saints' Days form their highest classes.

*Roman.*

DOUBLES OF THE FIRST CLASS.

Christmas.  
Epiphany.  
Easter Day.  
(Maundy Thursday till Easter  
Tuesday inclusive).  
Ascension.  
Whitsun Day.  
Whitsun Monday.  
Whitsun Tuesday.  
Corpus Christi.  
S. John Baptist.  
SS. Peter and Paul.  
Assumption.  
All Saints.  
Dedication of the Church.  
Feast of the Patron Saint.

DOUBLES OF THE SECOND CLASS.

Every Festival of an Apostle.  
S. Mark.  
S. Luke.

Purification.  
Annunciation.  
Nativity.  
Conception.  
Visitation.  
Circumcision.  
Name of JESUS.  
S. Stephen.  
Holy Innocents.  
S. Joseph.  
Holy Trinity.  
Invention of the Cross.  
S. Lawrence.  
S. Michael.

*Paris.*

ANNUALS.

Easter.  
Whitsun Day.  
Christmas.  
Assumption.  
Patron Saint.

GREATER SOLEMNS.

Ascension.  
Corpus Christi.  
Dedication.  
Epiphany.  
Purification.  
Annunciation.  
Nativity B. V. M.  
All Saints.  
SS. Dionysius and Rusticus.

LESSER SOLEMNS.

Trinity Sunday.  
The Secondary Patron.  
Circumcision.  
S. John Baptist.  
SS. Peter and Paul.

GREATER DOUBLES.

Easter Monday.  
Easter Tuesday.  
Whitsun Monday.  
Whitsun Tuesday.  
Low Sunday.  
Octave of Ascension.  
Corpus Christi.  
Festivals of Apostles and Evangelists.  
S. Michael.



It will be proper to make some observations on these Saints' Days.

And, in the first place, the Roman comes nearer to the Primitive Calendar than even the Parisian, in excluding Candlemas, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Annunciation from the highest class of Festivals; for (manifestly) the Parisian *Annals* and *Greater Solemnities* together make up the Roman Doubles of the First Class. In the latter, S. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, Assumption, and All Saints, are the only festivals of saints which occupy so high a place.

*S. John Baptist.* Let us compare the various offices of this Great Saint. In the Gregorian Missal, there were two Masses on this Festival;<sup>1</sup> and, it seems, in the former of these *Alleluia* was not sung, with reference to the Nativity having taken place under the old law; in the second Mass it was employed to signify the commencement of the new Kingdom by the Saint. The Roman Epistle is Isaiah xlix. 1—7. They point out how 'sharp' a 'sword' John indeed was, when he uttered that proclamation, 'O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?' And then, 'That hath formed me from the womb to be thy Servant,' well agrees with the sanctification of John, even from the mother's womb. But several of the German Missals had the Gospel of our own Prayer-Book, 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people;' and this was the Gallican usage. The Mozarabic Prophecy is the Roman Epistle: *its* Epistle we do not so well understand—Galat. i. 11—24—unless it be from the mere phrase, 'God, Who separated me from my mother's womb.' The Gospel is everywhere the same: the historical narrative from S. Luke. The Creed is not said; and that with the beautiful symbolical reason, 'He that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he.'

If we turn to the Breviary, we find the first three Roman lessons from Jeremiah i. 1 to end; the second three from the homily of S. Augustine (20) on the same Festival; the third three, from the commentary of S. Ambrose on the Gospel. The first six, in the greater part of the German Breviaries, are from a homily of S. Maximus: the last three from the commentary of V. Bede on the Gospel. The first six in the Aberdeen from a homily, we know not of what saint: the last three as the Roman. In the Parisian, the first three from 'the occurring Scripture;' the next three, a sermon of S. Augustine (not that in the Roman); the last three as the Roman.

Now we think that we can scarcely give a more useful praxis

<sup>1</sup> Durand. lib. iii. cap. 38. S. Aleuin. de Divin. Offic. cap. 30. Hug. de S. Vict. lib. iii. de Offic. Eccles. cap. 6.

on the various theories of Response, than by a comparison of those from the Lessons.

ROMAN AND GERMAN  
(generally).

1. R. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John; \*the same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that he might prepare a perfect people for the Lord. V. John was preaching in the wilderness the baptism of repentance. The same.

2. R. Elizabeth, the wife of Zachariah, bare a mighty man, John Baptist, forerunner of the Lord, \*who prepared for the Lord a way in the desert. V. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. Who prepared.

3. R. Before I formed thee in the womb I knew thee, and before thou camest out of the belly I sanctified thee, \*and gave thee for a prophet to the Gentiles. V. A man beloved by God, and honourable among men. And gave. Glory. And gave.

ABERDEEN.

1. *As Roman.*

2. R. The Angel Gabriel appeared to Zachariah, saying: A son shall be born to thee; his name shall be called John. \*And many shall rejoice at his birth. V. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink. And many.

3. R. Thou, Child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord \*to prepare His ways. V. To give knowledge of salvation unto His people for the remission of their sins. To prepare. Glory. To prepare.

PARIS (modern).

1. R. Elizabeth conceived and hid herself three months, saying: \*Thus hath the Lord dealt with me in the days wherein He looked upon me, and took away my reproach from among men. V. My age shall be exalted in rich loving kindness. Thus hath.

2. R. Mary entered into the house of Zachariah, and saluted Elizabeth, \*and when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb. V. Thou didst prevent them, O Lord, with the blessings of goodness. And when.

3. R. Elizabeth was filled with the HOLY GHOST, and cried with a loud voice, Whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come unto me? \*Behold, the babe leaped in my womb. V. Now I know that God hath blessed me for thy sake. Behold. Glory. The babe.

NANTES.

R. 1. The LORD\* formed me from the womb to be His servant, that I might bring back Jacob to Him. V. God that maketh things that are not, as though they were. Formed.

R. 2. I am glorified in the eyes of the LORD, and \*my GOD is my strength. V. When Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb. My GOD.

R. 3. Let me find grace in Thy sight: \*now I know that the LORD hath blessed thee for my sake. V. Elizabeth cried: When I heard the voice of thy salutation, the babe leaped in my womb. Now I know. Glory. Let me find.

ROMAN AND GERMAN  
(generally).

4. R. The Angel of the LORD came to Zachariah and said, Receive a son in thine old age. \*And he shall be called John. V. This child shall be great in the sight of the LORD; for the Lord also is with him. And he.

5. R. This is the beloved Forerunner and the Light that shone before the LORD. \*This is John, who both prepared the way of the LORD in the desert, and also preached of the Lamb of God, and illuminated the eyes of men. V. He shall go before Him in the spirit, and power of Elias. This is John.

ABERDEEN.

4. R. His name shall be called John; he shall drink neither wine nor strong drink. \*And many shall rejoice in his birth. V. He shall go before the LORD in the spirit and power of Elias. And many.

5. R. He shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias, \*that he may convert the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the unbelieving to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the LORD a perfect people. V. He shall be great before the LORD, and shall be filled with the HOLY GHOST. To make ready.

PARISIAN.

4. R. They made signs to his father, how he would have him called. And he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, \*His name is John; and they marvelled all. V. He shall be called by a name which the mouth of the LORD shall name. His name.

5. R. And immediately the mouth of Zachariah was opened, and he was filled with the HOLY GHOST, and prophesied, saying, Thou, Child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for \*thou shalt go before the face of the LORD to prepare His ways. V. Say not, I am a Child, saith the LORD, for whithersoever I shall send thee thou shalt go. Thou shalt go.

ROMAN AND GERMAN  
(generally).

R. 6. They made signs to his father how he would have him called: and he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, \* His Name is John. V. The mouth of Zachariah was opened, and he prophesied, saying, His Name. Glory. His Name.

ABERDEEN.

As in Roman.

PARISHIAN.

R. 6. The child increased, and waxed strong in spirit, and \* the was in the desert until the day of his shewing to Israel. V. And the child grew, and the LORD blessed him, and the SPIRIT of the LORD began to move him. And he was. Glory. He was.

NANTES.

R. 4. I will give thee hidden things and concealed treasures \*, that thou mayest know that I the LORD who call thy name am the Holy One of Israel. V. They beckoned to his father how he would have him called, and he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, His name is John. That thou mayest.

R. 5. The LORD declared His salvation \*. He hath remembered His mercy and truth toward the house of Israel. V. And immediately the mouth of Zachariah was opened, and he spake and blessed GOD. He hath remembered.

R. 6. I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people \*, even a marvellous work and a wonder. V. And all they that heard it laid it up in their hearts, saying, What manner of child shall this be?—And the hand of the LORD was with him. Even a marvellous. Glory. I will proceed.

ROMAN.

R. 7. The LORD's Forerunner cometh, of whom He Himself testifieth: \* Among them that are born of women there is not a greater than John Baptist. V. This is the Prophet, and the more than Prophet, of whom the SAVIOUR saith. Among.

R. 8. Gabriel the Angel appeared to Zachariah, and said, A son shall be born to thee, and his name shall be called John, \* and many shall rejoice in his birth. V. He shall be great in the sight of the LORD, and he shall drink neither wine nor strong drink. And many. Glory. And many.

ABERDEEN.

R. 7. They made signs to his father how he would have him called, and he called for a writing table, and wrote, saying, \* His name is John. V. The mouth of Zachariah was opened, and he prophesied, saying, His name.

R. 8. As Roman 7.

R. 9. Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist, \* who prepared the way of the LORD in the desert. V. There was a man sent from GOD whose name was John. Who. Glory. Who.

PARISH.

R. 7. There was a man sent from GOD whose name was John. \* He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light, that all might believe through him. V. He stood up as fire, and his word burned like a lamp. He was not.

R. 8. John bare testimony, and cried, saying: He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me, \* and of His fullness have all we received. V. I awakened up last of all, as one that gathereth after the grape gatherers. And of His.

R. 9. He that sent me, the same said to me, \* Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending and resting, † He it is that baptizeth with the HOLY GHOST. V. The LORD that formed me from the womb to be His servant saith. Upon. Glory. He it is.

Let us now take another example: it shall be the Feast of All Saints. And if these illustrations seem tedious to those who are not interested in the subject, it must be remembered that our pages are the only English publication open to those who are; and that in Liturgical matters, it has always been our desire to enter as deeply as the present state of the science will allow us into the questions which may arise.

Now, first let us observe what Durandus says as to this Festival. After relating how, on the dedication of the Pantheon, by Pope Boniface, into the Church of All Martyrs, the first of

May was fixed as the Festival of *Santa Maria ad Martyres*, and that this solemnity was afterwards removed to the other half year, the first of November, when the harvest had been got in, —he continues thus:—

‘Now, however, this Festival is general to All Saints—its office is accordingly varied. For the first Antiphon and the first Lection, and the first Responsory, are of the Trinity, because this is the Feast of the Trinity; the second of S. Mary, the third of the Angels, the fourth of the Prophets, the fifth of the Apostles, the sixth of the Martyrs, the seventh of the Confessors, the eighth of the Virgins, the ninth of all together. Therefore, the greatest person in the Church reads the first lesson, the Bishop, if he is present, or the Dean, or any-how a Priest; and so, by gradual degrees, down to the boys. One of the boys always reads the eighth lesson concerning Virgins; the last is read by the greatest person again. In many Churches, the eighth responsory is sung by five boys having candles in their hands, before the Altar of S. Mary, to represent the five prudent Virgins, who went forth to meet the Bridegroom.’

Sicardus tells us the same thing, only adding that in some Churches, the first Lesson is that from Isaiah, ‘I saw the LORD sitting upon His throne’—which it is in the Roman Church at this day. We will now give some examples of the Lessons and Responsories; and it will be found that English Rituals stood, as always, most faithful to the mediæval pattern.

In the Lessons, the Aberdeen Breviary appears to retain the old form, and gives a short homily, first on the Blessed Trinity; secondly on S. Mary, &c.; and so down to the end. The Benedictions also accord to this: we give them here:—

- I. In caritate perfecta confirmet nos Trinitas Sancta. *Lectio Prima de Trinitate: et legatur ab excellentiori persona.*
- II. Per intercessionem suæ matris benedicat nos Filius Dei Patris.
- III. Ad Societatem Civium Supernorum perducet nos Rex Angelorum.
- IV. Patriarcharum merita nos ducant ad regna celestia.
- V. Apostolorum intercessio nos jungat angelorum consortio.
- VI. Martyrum constantia nos ducat ad regna celestia.
- VII. Sancti Evangelii Lectio sit nobis salus et protectio.
- VIII. Chorus Sanctorum Virginum intercedat pro nobis ad Dominum.  
[And then follows the rubric: Let this Lection be read by one boy only in a surplice. And, in the meanwhile, let five boys go forth from the vestry in surplices, with covered heads and albs, and carrying lighted tapers in their hands, and let them sing the Response.]
- IX. Sanctorum meritis mereamur gaudia lucis.

The Mediæval German Breviaries, while they agree with the Aberdeen in their lections, have no such arrangement of Responses. We may observe that the observation of Durandus, with respect to the ninth Responsory of the Roman rite, shows that at that time it had not been obliterated by the *Te Deum*. Now let us give the Responses according to different rites, taking the Aberdeen as our pattern:—

ABERDEEN.(1)

R. 1. To the Supreme Trinity One God, be one Divinity, equal Glory, coeternal Majesty, to FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST,\* who subdueth the whole world to His laws. V. The Blessed Deity of FATHER and SON and Kind SPIRIT, give us grace. Who.

(1) These Aberdeen Responses are nearly, but not verbally, the same as those in the Responsoriale, published by Thomassin. (Tom. iv. p. 276.)

R. 2. For Blessed art thou, holy Virgin Mary, and most worthy of all praise.\* Since out of Thee hath arisen the Sun of Righteousness, CHRIST our God. V. Pray for the people, propitiate for the Clergy, intercede for the devout female sex: let all feel Thy help, who celebrate thy celebrity. Since.

R. 3. Thee, Holy LORD, all the Angels praise on high, saying,\* Praise and honour be to Thee, O LORD. V. Cherubim and Seraphim cry, Holy, and all the heavenly orders sing, Praise. Glory. Praise.

R. 4. Among them that are born of women, there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist,\* who prepared the way of the LORD in the desert. V. There was a man sent from God whose name was John. Who.

(1) Observe, while both the Aberdeen and Roman keep up the symbolism of Durandus and make the fourth Response typical of the prophets, and of John Baptist as their head, how much finer is the Roman Response, introducing him as it were in a procession; the idea is nobly followed out in that hymn, *Sponsa Christi que per orbem*.

R. 5. These the fellow-citizens of the Apostles, and the domestic servants of God, advance to-day,\* carrying torches in their hands, and illuminating their country to give peace to the Gentiles, and to set free the people of the LORD. V. Hear the prayers of us suppliants, who ask the rewards of eternal life, ye who bear in your hands the sheaves of righteousness, and who joyously come forward to-day. Carrying.

ROMAN.

R. 1. I saw the LORD sitting upon the throne, high and lifted up,\* and His train filled the Temple. V. The Seraphim stood above it, each one had six wings. And His train.

R. 2. Blessed art thou, Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who didst believe in the LORD: the things are accomplished in thee which were said of thee: behold, thou art exalted above the Choirs of the Angels.\* Intercede for us to the LORD our God. V. Hail, Mary, full of grace, the LORD is with thee. Intercede.

R. 3. Before the gods will I sing praise unto Thee,\* and I will worship toward Thy holy Temple, and will praise Thy name, O LORD. V. Because of Thy mercy and loving-kindness and truth, for Thou hast magnified Thy name and Thy word above all things. And I will. Glory. And I will.

R. 4. The forerunner of the LORD cometh, of whom He Himself testifieth.(1)\* Among them that are born of women, there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist. V. This is the prophet, and the more than prophet, of whom the Saviour saith. Among.

R. 5. These are they who, living in the flesh, planted the Church in their blood.\* They drank the cup of the LORD, and became the friends of God. V. Their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world.(1) They drank.

PARISIAN.

R. 1. We render Thee thanks, LORD God Almighty, which is and was and is to come,\* Because Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power, and hast given reward to the Saints. V. All Thy works shall praise Thee, O LORD, and Thy Saints shall give thanks unto Thee. Because.

R. 2. Then was given unto the Angel much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all Saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne.\* And the smoke of the incense ascended up before God out of the Angel's hand. V. The eyes of the LORD are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers. And the smoke.

R. 3. Sing praises unto our God all ye His servants, and ye who fear God, both small and great.\* For the LORD God omnipotent reigneth. Rejoice in the LORD, O ye righteous, for it becometh well the just to be thankful. For. Glory. Rejoice.

R. 4. All these attained a good report through faith.\* Wherefore we also being compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run with patience the race that is set before us. V. All these were honoured in their generations, merciful men, whose righteousness hath not been forgotten. Wherefore.

R. 5. There was given unto them white raiment, and it was said unto them, that they should yet wait a little time\* until their fellow-servants and brethren should be fulfilled. V. Bring my soul out of prison that I may give thanks unto Thy name, which thing if thou wilt grant me, then shall the righteous resort unto my company. Until.

(1) It is this verse which fixes the whole Responsory as belonging to the Apostles, rather than, which might have been the case with the former part, to any other Saints.

## ABERDEEN.

R. 6. O laudable constancy of the Martyrs, O inextinguishable love, O invincible patience, which, although it seemed despicable among the tortures of the persecutors,\* should be found to praise and glory and honour† in the time of retribution. V. We pray, therefore, that they, thus honoured by our FATHER, which is in Heaven, may help us, and that their merits, Should be found. Glory. In the time.

R. 7. Let your loins be girded, and burning lamps in your hands,\* and ye yourselves like men that wait for their LORD, when He shall return from the wedding. V. Watch, therefore, for ye know not at what time your LORD shall come. And ye yourselves.

R. 8. I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Come to Me, O ye wise virgins.\* Lay up oil in your vessels until the Bridegroom shall come. V. At midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Lay up.

R. 9. Grant to us, O LORD, pardon of our sins, and at the intercession of the Saints, whose solemnity to-day we celebrate,\* give us such devotion† that we may merit to attain to their society. V. May their merits assist us, whom our own sins fetter: may their intercession excuse us, whom our own actions accuse. Grant. Glory. That.

## ROMAN.

R. 6. O ye my Saints, who, while ye were in the flesh, fought the good fight,\* I will render to you the reward of your labour. V. Come, ye blessed of my FATHER, inherit the kingdom. I will. Glory. I will.

R. 7. The same as Aberdeen.

R. 8. At midnight there was a cry made,\* Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. V. O ye prudent Virgins, trim your lamps. Behold. Glory. Behold.

R. 9. None.

## PARISIAN.

R. 6. The LORD God shall call His servants by another name,\* for the former miseries shall have passed away. V. There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying. For. Glory. For.

R. 7. God, who is rich in mercy, for the great love where-with He has loved us, hath quickened us,\* and hath made us sit together in CHRIST JESUS, that He might show us the abundant riches of His grace. V. The meek also shall increase their joy in the LORD, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the HOLY ONE of Israel. And hath made.

R. 8. We have been filled with Thy mercy, O LORD, and we have been glad and rejoice in Thy salvation.\* We have been comforted for the days wherein Thou hast plagued us, and for the years wherein we have suffered adversity. V. Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. We have been.

R. 9. Thou hast redeemed us to God by Thy Blood, out of every kindred and tongue and nation.\* And† Thou hast made us a kingdom and a priesthood to our God, and we shall reign. V. Thou shalt bring them in and plant them in the mountain of Thine inheritance. And. Glory. Thou hast made.

Thus we have gone through one of the most remarkable series of the Responsories in the Western Offices. The Aberdeen, as we said, keeps close to the original theory; but, probably, there are very few who will not think that the partial change in the Roman is a great improvement; and we ourselves are not ashamed to confess that the Parisian is yet more to our taste. Let us see, before we proceed to other subjects, how the Eastern Church celebrates the same day. We must bear in mind that, properly speaking, this Festival does not exist in the Oriental books; but that the Octave of Whitsunday is appropriated as All Saints' Sunday. Both East and West manage this octave admirably: the West regarding the descent of the Holy Ghost as designed to lead His people into all truth of



belief; the East as intended to teach them all holiness of life. Now, let us hear the stichera of the First Vespers: how different from the Responsories of the West, and yet how beautiful:—

*'Laying aside all.*

'Ye that spake by the SPIRIT, ye that were the disciples of the Saviour, ye that were the organs of the HOLY GHOST, ye that worked through faith, were scattered abroad to the boundaries of the earth, sowing everywhere the word of orthodox truth: and from that seed, by the tillage and grace of the Divine Hand, sprang the armies of the Martyr who imaged, through their various tortures, the glorious passion of their LORD, and who boldly intercede for our souls:

'Given over to wild beasts, slain with the sword, tormented with the hook, their hands struck off, their whole frames stretched on the rack, the brave Martyrs! and made an offering to fierce fire, they looked forward to the coming rest, and the time undefiled by sorrow, and the glory of CHRIST; to whom they boldly intercede for our souls.

'From one end of the earth to the other, they that agonised for the faith, Apostles, Martyrs, Priests, that did the will of God, women filled with courage beyond their sex, a holy assembly,—they are to be praised by the Church on earth; for they mingled with the earthly the celestial, with mortality immortality, through the grace of CHRIST; and now, shining around us as a constellation, they boldly intercede for our souls. Glory.

'Divine choir of Martyrs, foundation of the Church, accomplishment of the Gospel, ye by your deeds made good the words of the Saviour: for by you the gates of hell, yawning wide against the Church, were closed: the offering of your blood dried up the libations poured first to idols: your sacrifice is the accomplishment of the faith; your courage astonished the bodiless powers; wearers of the Crown, ye now stand in the presence of God, to whom ye boldly intercede for our souls. Both now.'

In the Canon at Lauds we find no trace of the various Orders of Saints. It seems rather that each Ode again begins from the Blessed Trinity, and derives each grace of the SPIRIT, each heroic action of virtue, from that source. Let us take a few stanzas of the Canon more particularly referring to the Saints.

*Canon of the Saints of which the Acrostich is, I sing the various ranks of all the Saints.*

**'ODE I.**

*'Pharaoh the Charioteer.*

'WHILE I hymn the ranks of Thy Saints, I pray that my mind may be enlightened with Thy light, through their intercessions: for Thou art the light that cannot be approached to. Thou art He who by Thy torch dost dispel the darkness of ignorance, WORD of GOD, CHRIST, Giver of light.

'WHEN Thou wast raised upon the Cross, Thou didst draw to the knowledge of Thee all the heritage of the Gentiles, and through Thy Apostles didst illuminate them with the light of the Blessed Trinity, by whom also Thou didst drive away error.

'THY Apostles, O CHRIST, obeying Thy legislation, through the light of Thy grace, glorious Saints as they were, gave joy to the whole world, preaching Thee evangelically.

'THE Martyrs, with joy taking up Thy Cross, and unceasingly imitating Thy Passion, feared not the threat of the tyrant, neither fire, nor sword, nor scourge, neither famine nor death.

And much in the same style are all the Odes of this Canon. Very different, indeed, from the foregoing is the popular Armenian hymn,—or, rather sequence,—on All Saints. We will give it as nearly as possible in the character of the original:—

Our LORD, an old man with a white, white beard,  
On the Cross in glory stands:  
And He cried to the sailors that onward steered,  
'Oh sailors! my sailors! my brothers so dear,  
'Take in the old man as ye onward steer;  
'And the passage-fare shall be my prayer  
'As ye go to the distant lands!'

'White-bearded old man! away! away!  
'Our ship is not for prayer:  
''Tis a merchant's freight;—and he must pay  
'Who would enter, a heavy fare.'

He signed the Cross, and He sealed a deed:  
A stone was His money: 'There!  
(As He stretch'd His Hand, and He took of the sand,)  
'Is money to pay My fare.'

He paid the fare, and He entered the bark:  
'There is money for one and for all.'  
Then the ocean billows grow troubled and dark,  
And from heaven the storm-drops fall.

'Whence comest Thou then, O man of sin,  
'Thou art lost and hast lost us too?'  
'Put the good ship's helm my grasp within,  
'And slumber in safety may you.'

His right hand signed the Cross full soon,  
With His left the ship he steer'd;  
And it had not come to the high high noon  
When the harbour at hand appear'd.

Brothers! arise from your sleep so sweet:  
So sweet, with dreams so dark:  
Fall down and worship at JESUS' feet:  
Here is our LORD, and the bark!

Manifestly, in this allegory, the ship is the world: the merchant, who freights it, Satan:—the rejection of the SAVIOUR as a passenger, His rejection in His own Person on earth:—the sand, of which He makes money, the earthly vessel in which He lays up His Grace, namely, the Martyrs and other Saints. There is a somewhat similar Georgian allegory: too like to make a translation necessary, yet with some national differences.

We must remember that it was a long time, even in the West, before any were admitted to the title of Confessors, except those who had actually confessed CHRIST in torture, and

come off with life. While, at the present time, all those Saints in the Western Church who are not Martyrs, are dignified with the title of Confessors, S. Martin being the first who obtained this honour, the Homologetes of the East is much more nearly confined to its original signification. At the same time, the various classes of Saints in the Oriental Church are far more minutely characterised than those in the West. Here, for example, we have Isapostle as well as Apostle. This title is given to bishops of Apostolic consecration; to holy women, fellow-labourers with the Apostles, as S. Mary Magdalene and S. Priscilla; to the first preachers of the faith in any country—as we speak of the Apostle of Bavaria, or Belgium or Northumberland; and to the princes, like Constantine or Vladimir, under whose auspices Christianity became established in their country. Then we have the *megalo-martyr*, for those who were more especially illustrious by their sufferings; the *hierio-martyr*, for those who were priests as well as martyrs; the *hosio-martyr*, for the religious of both sexes who obtained that crown; and the *thaumaturgos*, or wonder-worker, attributed to Saints of all descriptions who were more especially conspicuous for the gift of miracles.

On such a subject as that on which we are speaking, nay, on each branch of it, whole volumes might be written. But we must next turn our attention to the occurrence and concurrence of one Festival with another; the treatment of which difficulty forms one of the most striking advantages possessed by the Western over the Eastern Church.

In case any of our readers should be unacquainted with these technical terms, he must observe: one Festival *occurs* with another when the two feasts fall on the same day; as if Holy Thursday happened on May 1, SS. Philip and James. One Festival *concurs* with another, when its vigil falls on that other: S. Mark would concur with Easter, if Easter were on the 24th of April.

Every such difficulty is arranged by means of two little tables: but this is a late invention; and the earlier missals, such as the Incunabula, and those of the first thirty years of the sixteenth century, have very long and laborious rules for explaining what service is to be said in case of occurrences. At the longest, however, they were nothing to compare for length with the *typicon* of the Greek, the *oustaff* of the Russian Church. Each of these is comprised in a thick folio volume; and nothing can be more puzzling than the directions so given. But here we may observe the greater flexibility of the West. The Western Church, when two important Festivals occur, can translate the one: the Eastern knows no such arrangement; neither in the

Oriental Church is a Festival ever omitted. Take, therefore, such an extreme case as the Annunciation occurring with Good Friday; the service is of both; and to a Western student the effect is extremely jarring and unpleasant. Eastern ritualists, however, admire the junction of the two, as one of the chief beauties of their Office Book; and all one can say is, that great allowance must be made for use on both sides. The earlier Western custom had much more resemblance to the East than has the present. Thus, according to modern Roman use, if Lady Day falls in Holy Week, it is transferred to the Monday after Low Sunday. But according to Sarum use, if it fell on the Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday in Holy Week, it was celebrated on that day.

Now this question of occurrences assumes great importance with respect to our own Prayer-Book. No doubt, had tables been the custom at the time of the Reformers, they would have adopted them, and so left us a certain rule. But as the rubrics on the subject were then so very lengthy, for the sake of that brevity on which the compilers of the Prayer-Book so much prided themselves, they were no doubt passed by. And here arises our great difficulty: we cannot in this respect follow the Sarum Use, because we have no power to translate a Festival. That is to say, though we have known instances in which, on their own authority, individual clergymen have done so, it seems doubtful how far they might not be contravening the Act of Uniformity by such a practice. The question then arises, whether it is better for that year to omit entirely a Festival which would have been translated, or irregularly to commemorate it. Our own practice has always been the former; but, if it is to be commemorated at all, it should be in the simplest way, merely by the addition of the Collect. Yet to our minds there is something extremely displeasing, on such a great Feast as the Ascension, to commemorate additionally SS. Philip and James; or, on Easter Day, the Annunciation or S. Mark.

There was a curious occurrence in the last century between a State and a Church Festival. George II. succeeded to the crown on the 11th of June. The Accession Service was printed with a special notice that the Feast of S. Barnabas was to be entirely ignored; and accordingly for twenty-six years that Apostle had no commemoration in the English Church. Then came the change of Kalendar; and Archbishop Herring exerted himself to procure an alteration. A fresh rubric thenceforward fixed the king's accession to the 22d of June.

The idea entertained by the bishops of Charles II.'s time as to occurrences, may be seen by the rubric prefixed to the now abrogated service for the Restoration. If the day happened to

be Ascension Day or Whit Sunday, the State Collect only was added; if it were Monday or Tuesday in Whitsun-week, or Trinity Sunday, the State Psalms also were said; but if it fell on any other Sunday, the whole State Service took precedence of the Sunday office. But even on Whit Sunday, the proper hymn supplanted the Venite. In the rubric for our present Accession Service, that office is ordered to be said on Sundays, without any notice of the fact that the 20th of June might just fall on Trinity Sunday; in which case, surely no one would be so Erastian as to obey the rubric literally.

In many of the Gallican Breviaries, a further difficulty arises with respect to those Festivals which, though inferior in the Church's estimation, are kept as holy days by the people. It might, for example, happen, that a local bishop who, as the phrase goes, was 'festivated,' might occur with such a day as Whitsun Tuesday, or the octave of the Ascension, which was not festivated. The lesser feast ought in that case to have been translated; but it is very hard to translate a popular holiday; and the State also discouraged it, on account of money falling due, or leases falling in—as was so often the case—on such a Saint's day. If the Church allowed the day to be translated, there might arise all kind of legal questions as to whether the original day to which the deed referred, still held good, or altered in consequence of the translation. There are, therefore, in the Churches where occurrences like these are likely or possible, as in that of S. Brieuc, Quimper, (or, as it is generally called, Cornouailles,) and Mende, another set of rubrics which refer to such cases. Generally, the superior Feast is allowed for the nonce to be translated. And in case the holiday fell in Holy Week, although the office was translated, the festivation that year was abolished.

It is well known that something of the same kind occurred in the Concordat of 1801, at the instance of Napoleon: the transference of the holiday and procession of Corpus Christi to the following Sunday. Those who have been in France or Belgium on the *Fête-Dieu* itself, know that it is scarcely observed at all, not even in country places, by larger congregations than usual.

We will now give a table of occurrences, such as might be recommended by some future convocation for the use of the English Church.

### OCCURRENCES.

Double of the First Class . .	4	6	2	8	4	4	1
Double of the Second Class .	4	6	8	1	4	1	1
Within the Octave . . . . .	3	7	5	5	3	3	3
The Octave . . . . .	7	4	3	3	4	3	3
	The Octave.	Within the Octave.	Double of the Second Class.	Double of the First Class.	Ordinary Sunday.	Sunday of the Second Class.	Sunday of the First Class.

1. Translation of the first ; office of the second.
2. Office of the first ; translation of the second.
3. Commemoration of the first ; office of the second.
4. Office of the first ; commemoration of the second.
5. Nothing of the first ; office of the second.
6. Office of the first ; nothing of the second.
7. Office of the more worthy ; commemoration of the less worthy.
8. Office of the more worthy ; translation of the less worthy.

### CONCURRENCES.

Second Vespers of	Sundays of the First or Second Cl.	4	3	3	3	0	First Vespers.
	Ordinary Sundays . . . . .	4	3	1	1	0	
	Double of the First Class . . . . .	2	4	4	6	4	
	Double of the Second Class . . . . .	4	4	6	3	4	
	Octave . . . . .	4	6	3	1	4	
	Within the Octave . . . . .	6	3	1	1	3	
		Within the Octave.	Octave.	Double of the Second Class.	Double of the First Class.	Any Sunday.	



1. All of the following ; nothing of the preceding.
2. All of the preceding ; nothing of the following.
3. Office of the following ; commemoration of the preceding.
4. Office of the preceding ; commemoration of the following.
6. Office of the more worthy ; commemoration of the less worthy.

To make the table complete, we must add that—

Sundays of the First Class are : I. of Advent, I. of Lent, Passion, Palm, Easter, Low, Pentecost, Trinity. Sundays of the Second Class are : the others of Advent, the others of Septuagesima.

And that the following are Greater Feriæ, which are always commemorated by the addition of the preceding Sunday Collect : Advent, Lent, Ember Days, Rogation Monday. Let us now apply these rules to the anniversaries which will take place during the remainder of this year.

Sept. 29th, S. Michael and All Angels, the 30th being the Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity. Thus by the table of concurrences ; (S. Michael being a Festival of the Second Class ; the Seventeenth after Trinity an ordinary Sunday :) the intersecting square gives 4 ; 4 is explained to be the whole of the preceding, with commemoration of the following. Therefore on that Saturday evening the Lessons and First Collect are of S. Michael, the Second Collect of the Sunday.

Oct. 28, SS. Simon and Jude, occurs with the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity. SS. Simon and Jude is a Festival of the Second Class, the Sunday an ordinary Sunday. The intersecting square gives 4 : 4 is explained, office of the first, commemoration of the second, the first being here the feast, the second being the Sunday. The whole service will then be of the Saint's Day, with the addition of the Sunday Collects. And the rule which governs the feast governs the vigil ; therefore on Saturday, Oct. 27, the first Collect is of the Festival, the second is of the Sunday. These are all the occurrences, &c. which take place during this year.

Only one other observation we may make : suppose that the Second Vespers of an ordinary Sunday were to concur with the First Vespers of a Festival of the First or Second Class, as if the 27th of October were the Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity ; then the First Lesson at Vespers is not the proper Lesson for the Sunday, but for the day of the month ; as in the instance we have given, it would not be Ezekiel xxiv. but Ecclesiasticus ix.

It seems necessary, too, to say a few words as to the selection of Apocryphal Lessons for the greater part of Saints' Days. The vulgar opinion seems to be that the compilers of the Prayer-Book refused to have Sunday Lectures from the Apocryphal Books, as not thinking them worthy of the solemnity of that

day. The truth is just the opposite, as any one may convince themselves who will study the Office drawn up by Jeremy Taylor in the necessities of the Great Rebellion. Just because, in their opinion, an ordinary Saint's Day stood above an ordinary Sunday, they selected chapters from the Sapiential Books, whether Ecclesiasticus, the Wisdom of Solomon, Proverbs, or Ecclesiastes, which they thought the most distinctly and strikingly useful. We may be quite certain that, had they entertained the same ideas regarding the relative sanctity of the days which vulgar Protestants of the present time entertain, our First Sunday-Lessons would have been from the Apocrypha, and those for the Saints' Days, from the less striking and less generally useful of the historical or prophetic books. Never let this be forgotten, that a far greater proportion of the Apocrypha is read by us yearly than is read of the rest of the Old Testament. The two Books of Esdras, properly speaking, cannot claim that title, and are in no sense canonical. Of the rest, we omit the two Books of Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasses, but hardly a chapter in the remaining Books; while, on the other hand, fully one-third of the Old Testament is utterly omitted, and we have but two or three chapters of the Apocalypse.

To turn to another subject: it may be well to say something as to the various epochs at which the Saints commemorated in various Kalendars flourished. We have been at the pains to reckon up those who have a place in the Parisian Breviary, according to their centuries; and the result is as follows:—

In Century I. there are	36.	In Century IX. there are	1.
II.	13.	X.	1.
III.	35.	XI.	1.
IV.	33.	XII.	5.
V.	19.	XIII.	13.
VI.	25.	XIV.	4.
VII.	23.	XV.	0.
VIII.	10.	XVI.	4.
In Century XVII. there are		4.	

And from this skeleton of a tabular view, we get a very fair idea of the history of the Church of France. The first century is, of course, occupied by Apostolic and Isapostolic festivals, pretty equally common to the whole Church; in the second, while we lose them, France was not yet sufficiently evangelised to give us many saints; the third and fourth ages form the epoch of her glory; in the fifth there was a remarkable fall, to be accounted for from the anarchical breaking up of the Roman Empire, which has left its impress on the table; in the sixth and seventh centuries, again, the Gallican Church shone forth brightly; in the eighth, she began to grow dim;

the ninth, tenth, and eleventh were days of darkness, and give us between them but three saints; in the twelfth, the monastic reformation began to tell; the thirteenth was the second spring of the Gallican Church; the fourteenth began well, but the miseries of English invasion soon overwhelmed it. Every one acquainted with French history would call the fifteenth, next to the eighteenth, its worst age, and it made no addition to its Hagiology. The sixteenth and seventeenth have each four Saints, S. Vincent de Paul and S. Francis de Sales being the brightest stars of that little constellation.

We are fond of speaking of the England of Saints. But how many more saints have the French Sees added to the Kalendar of the Church than any of our own! This, of course, arises partly from the fact, that the earlier French Bishoprics had already existed five hundred years when our own were formed; but still, even with this excuse, we fear that the difference is not entirely accounted for. We will now take a few Gallican Breviaries, and notice the Saints peculiar to each See which they commemorate; and they shall be the Parisian, that of Metz, and that of Nantes. By way of contrast with this, we will then do the same thing for the Toledo and other Breviaries.

Jan.	PARIS.	NANTES.	METZ.
3	S. Genovefa, V. 512.	S. Genovefa, V. 512.	
4	Rigobert, Bishop of Rheims, 743.		Genovefa, V. 512.
14	Hilary, Bishop of Poitou, 368.	The same.	The same.
15	Maurus, Abbat of Glanfeuil, VI. Century.	The same.	
	Bonitus, Bishop of Clermont, 710.		
16	William, Bishop of Bourges, 1309.		
19	Sulpicius Pius, Bishop of Bourges, 644.		
	S. Launomar, near Chartres, Abbat, 594.		
27	Julian, first Bish. of Le Mans, III. or IV. Cent.	Th: same.	
30	Bathildis, Queen, 680. Radegund, V. 680.		Radegund, V. 680.
Feb.			
6	Vedastus, B. of Arras, 539.		Vedastus, B. of Arras, 539.
10	S. William de Mala Valle, Hermit, 1157.		
March			
1	Albinus, B. of Angers, 549.	The same.	
3		Guingalous, Abbat near Quimper, 532.	
6			Chrodogang, B. of Metz, 767.
10.	Droctoveus, 1st Abbat of S. Vincent at Paris, 578.		
12		Paul, 1 B. of S. Pol de Léon, 573.	
30	Regulus, 1 B. of Senlis, 320.		
April			
16		Paternus, 1 B. of Vannes, 448.	
22	Invention of SS. Dionysius, Rusticus, and Eleutherius, 630.		
	Opportuna, V. 770.		

	PARIS.	NANTES.	METZ.
April			
30	Eutropius, B. of Saintes and M. III. Cent.	Eutropius, B. of Saintes and M. III. Cent.	
May			
2			Translation of S. Clement, 1 B. of Metz, 1090.
4		Briocus, 1 B. of S. Briec, 502.	
11	Mamertus, B. of Vienne, 475.	Gildas, Abbat, VI. Cent.	Mamertus, B. of Vienne, 475.
13		Mamertus, B. of Vienne, 475.	
16	Honoratus, B. of Amiens, 600.		
19	Ivo, P. of Quimper, 1303.	Ivo, P. of Quimper, 1303.	
24	Donatian and Rogatian, M.M. 287.	DONATIAN and ROGATIAN, M. M. 287.	
		Greater Solemn.	
28	Germanus, B. of Paris, 576.		
June			
2	Pothinus, B. of Lyons, Blaudina, V. and 46 other Martyrs, 177.	As Paris.	As Paris.
3	Clotildis, Q. of France, 537.	Clotildis, Q. of France, 537.	Clotildis, Q. of France, 537.
6			Claudius, Archbp. of Besançon, 581.
7		Mercadoc, B. of Vannes, 600.	
8	Medardus, B. of Noyon, 525.	As Paris.	As Paris.
10	Landeric, B. of Paris, 656.		
16		Similianus, B. of Nantes, IV. Century.	
18		Hervacius, Monk, near S. Pol de Léon, VI. Cent.	
21		Merennus, Abbot, near S. Maclou, 617.	
25	Gohardus, Aglibertus, and their companions, Martyrs, III. Cent.	Gohardus, B. of Nantes, 843.	
28	Irenæus, B. of Lyons, and Doctor of the Church, M. 202.	As in Paris.	As in Paris.
30	S. Theobald, Hermit—Normandy, 1066.		

These six months will afford a very good example of local saints, since, with the exception of S. Hilary, S. Mamertus, S. Pothinus, and S. Irenæus, none of the holy men here commemorated have been received into the general Kalendar of the Church. Let us make another selection of the same kind; and this time, instead of comparing three Churches of the same nation, let us take three illustrious Churches of different nations. They shall be Aberdeen for Scotland; Toledo for Spain; Cologne for Germany:—

JAN.	ABERDEEN.	COLOGNE.	TOLEDO.
7	Kentigerna, Matron.		
8	Nathalanus, Bish.		
9	Felanus, Abbot.		
11		Death of the Third King.	
16	Furse, Abbot.		
21			
23			Fructuosus, Martyr.
			ILDEFONSO, Archbp. of Toledo, Double of the Second Class, with an Octave.
24			Descent of the B. V. into the Cathedral of Toledo.
28			Julian, B. of Concha, Double of the Second Class.
29	Voloc, Bishop.		
30	Glascian, Bishop.		Valerius, B. of Saragossa, Octave of S. Ildefonso.

Feb.	ABERDEEN.	COLOGNE.	TOLEDO.
1			Cæcilius, B. and M.
5	Modanus, Abbot.		
12			First translation of S. Eugenius, Archbp. of Toledo.
17	Finnanus, B.		
18	Colmannus, B.		
March			
1	Monan, Confessor.	Huicbert, B.	Helladius, Archbp. of Toledo.
	Morman, B.		
6	Baldric, B.		
8	Duthac, B.		
10	Kessog.		Julian, Archbp. of Toledo.
11			Eulogius, Presbyter and Martyr.
12	Constantine, King & Martyr.		
14	Kevoca, V.		
16		Heribert, B.	
18	Finian, B.		
26		Ludger, B.	

These three months may suffice as an example of the above sees. Now let us turn to another subject.

Besides the commemoration of Saints, there are in certain local Kalendars notices of national events, connected with the well-being of the Church. Thus, in the Parisian Breviary, we have on the 18th of August a commemoration of the victory of Philip the Fair in Flanders, A.D. 1304. It is worth while to give the Lessons which refer to this event. In the first nocturn, the lections of the occurring Scripture. In the second nocturn.

#### FOURTH LESSON.

Philip the Fair, King of the French, in the year 1304, about the Feast of S. Mary Magdalene, having set forth with his brothers Charles and Louis, and a large army, into Flanders, pitched his tents near Mons, where was the camp of the rebel Flemings. But when, on the 18th of August, which was the third Feria after the Assumption of S. Mary, the French had from morning till evening stood on the defence, and were resting themselves at nightfall; the enemy, by a sudden attack, rushed on the camp of the King with that fury, that his body-guard had scarcely time to defend him.

R. Come from Lebanon, my Spouse,\* come and thou shalt be crowned.† The odour of thy sweet ointments is above all perfumes. V. The Righteous Judge shall give a crown of righteousness. Come. Glory. The odour.

#### FIFTH LESSON.

At the beginning of the fight, the life of the King was in great danger. But shortly after, his troops crowding together from all quarters to his tent, where the battle was sharpest, obtained an illustrious victory over the enemy. The pious King immediately understood that this had been won by no human hand, but from God, at the intercession of the Mother of God; whence, with all humility, he ascribed the whole praise of the victory to Him Who had shown Himself the defender of the most righteous cause.

R. Thou art all fair, my love,\* there is no spot in thee; come from Lebanon,† the odour of thy garments is as the odour of incense. V. They that have not defiled their garments, they shall walk with Me in white, for they are worthy. There is no. Glory. The odour.

#### SIXTH LESSON.

But that the memory of such a benefit should be transmitted to posterity, and that due honour should be paid to the Virgin Mary for this celestial help, Philip by a deed, dated in the Camp near Lille, in the month of September,

gave to the Church of Paris an annual revenue of a hundred francs for ever for the use of the Dean and Chapter, on this condition, that this revenue should be distributed among those only who attend at the First Vespers, at Matins, and at Mass, on this day.

R. Righteousness shall go before thee, and the glory of the LORD shall be thy reward;\* the LORD shall fill thy mind with glory. V. An entrance shall be abundantly administered into the eternal kingdom. And the glory. Glory. The LORD.

This may serve as an example of so very undesirable a mixture of politics and religion. The great Triumph of the Cross, celebrated in all the Spanish Breviaries, on the 14th of July, stands on a very different footing, because it was that victory which crushed the Saracen power in Spain, and made that nation a part of the Christian republic of States. We will not trouble the reader with Responsories; but they are not unworthy of the subject: and the Lessons from the various parts of the New Testament which treat of the Cross are singularly beautiful. In the Churches of Sardinia a most offensive service was in vogue till the end of the last century, in which the defeat of the French at Sassari was commemorated; the hymns, to excite the popular passion to the utmost, were vernacular, and began thus:—

‘ Muiran, muiran los Francescos,  
Ils trahidors de Sassaresos,  
Qui han fit la trahicio  
Al molt alt rey de Arago.’

We ought now to speak of the various *memoria technica* which are to be found in most Kalendars. No doubt the ordinary run of uneducated priests in the Middle Ages found considerable difficulty in remembering the succession of Lessons which made up the Church's year. The barbarous verses in which they are set forth can only remind one of the *Memoria Technica* for the order of the Epistles, itself, we believe, of the time of Queen Elizabeth.

Rom. Cor. Cor. Gal. Ephes. Phil. Col. Thes. Thessalo. Tim. Tim.  
Tit. Phil. Hebrews, James, Pet. Pet. 3 John, Jude, Revelation.

Take, for example, these, which are from the Aberdeen Breviary:—

Post tres personas librum regum dare debes.

(It is scarcely necessary to observe that the *poet* would tell us that the Book of Kings is to be commenced after Trinity,—as we commence it now. He then goes on to tell us which Vigils are also Fasts.)

Nat. Domini, penthe, Johan. Paul sumptio sancta  
Istis vigiliis jejunemus luceque Marci  
Petrus et Andreas Paulus cum Simone Judas,  
Ut jejunemus nos admonet atque Matheus.



For July we have the following :—

Et post Sampsonem sapientem da Salomonem.

(that is, after the Feast of S. Sampson—some of our readers may remember his church at York—on July 28, the Wisdom of Solomon is begun.)

For August we have :—

Post Augustinum doctorem Job lege justum.

(that is, after S. Augustine's Day.)

In September :—

Tobiam dictum post Protum atque Jacintum :

Subjungas Judith post vigiliamque Mathei :

Post Sanctum Cosmam dabis historiam Maccabeo.'

(that is, Tobit is begun after the 11th of September, the Feast of SS. Protus and Jacinthus : Judith after the Vigil of S. Matthew : the Maccabees after S. Cosmes, Sep. 27.)

For October :—

Post Judam Simonem subjungas Ezechielem. \*

For November we have a very neat line :—

Adventus Domini sequitur solennia Linii.

(that is, the first Sunday after the Feast of S. Linus, Nov. 26th, is Advent Sunday).

Some such practical *memoriæ* have kept their place in village recitation ; thus :—

First comes David, then comes Chad,  
Then comes Winnold as if he were mad.

Or again—and any one in the habit of daily service at the most usual time must often have admired its truth—

S. Matthew, get candlesticks new :  
S. Matthi, lay candlesticks by.

And so the well-known dread which mediæval ages had of the occurrence of Good Friday with the Annunciation, was expressed by :—

When our Lady falls in our Lord's lap,  
Then let England look for mishap.

We had occasion to speak in a former paper of the tendency there was, during the later period of the Middle Ages, to substitute for the long Ferial Psalms, Saints'-day offices wherever it was practicable. We were not aware, when we wrote that article, of a singular rubric in some of the early German Breviaries ; we quote it from the Cologne :—

Et ideo nemo ascribat feriis in Kalendario vacantibus sanctum aut sanctos, nisi Patronus ipsius legentis non interfuerit. Aliqui ex pigritia requirentes sanctum aut sanctos ex aliis Kalendaris, volentes illum aut illos servare ubi

in Kalendario predictæ ecclesiæ Feria vacat, ut non legantur Nocturni: illi errant. Quia debent servare id quod est debitum et institutum secundum majorem ecclesiam suæ diocesis et non quod est eis placitum; secundum dictum beati Hieronymi qui dicit: Ingratum est Spiritui Sancto quid quid obtuleris: neglecto eo ad quod teneris.

We might also speak at some length of the Mediæval Festivals which later times have dispensed with altogether. Such, for example, were:—The Feast of the Invention of the Child, on the Friday after Sexagesima, for which several elegant hymns were written in German Breviaries; the Feast of the Face of our LORD—a very pretty simple hymn may be seen on this day in the Meissen Breviary; it was on the 15th of January; the Feast of the Blood of our LORD—this, in early Breviaries, is marked for the 26th of March. And the reason is, that to the 25th of March is attributed, in most Mediæval Kalendars, the Passion, and to the 27th the Resurrection. In Venice, this commemoration takes place on the first Friday in March; in the diocese of Linz on the Monday after Trinity. The Feast of the Passion is marked in many Breviaries for the 15th of November. The Feast of the Teeth of our LORD was fixed for the Tuesday in the third week of Lent, in some Dalmatian Breviaries. The Feast of the Hair of our LORD was celebrated on the Thursday before Trinity Sunday, in some Churches where this relic was venerated. The Feast of the Milk of our Lady was not a very uncommon commemoration in Germany, and especially in the province of Salzburg, where a noted relic of this kind was kept: it was on the octave of the Nativity of S. Mary: and hence, no doubt, the title *Liebfrauenmilch* to the excellent German wine of that name. Again, the Feast of the Ass, which was celebrated at Rouen with such singular pomp, and in which, instead of Amen, the response to all the prayers was *Hinhan*. The Feast of the Division of the Apostles was a most celebrated one in Germany for the 15th of July, and has given rise to some of the finest early sequences which we possess. Many of the Gallican Breviaries occupy the Fridays of Lent with various commemorations of our LORD. For example: First Friday, the Feast of His Tears; Second, of the LORD's Prayer; Third, of the LORD's Discourses; Fourth, of the LORD's Parables; Fifth, of the LORD's Sufferings. These commemorations, it need hardly be said, are among the very latest developments.

Among the curiosities of Mediæval Kalendars must be reckoned those half-religious, half-medical verses which are to be found at the end of each month. Take, for example, the following, which occur in most of the Breviaries in North Italy. For January:—

In Jano claris calidisque cibis potiaris,  
Atque decens potus tibi sit post fercula notus.  
Sedet enim medo potatus ut bene credo ;  
Balnea tutus intres et venam findere cures.

We will give only one specimen more :—

Nascitur occulta febris Februario multa.  
Potibus et escis si caute minuere velis.  
Tunc cave frigora, tunc de pollice, funde cruorem,  
Suge favum mellis pectoris morbosque curabit.

One of the peculiarities of Mediæval Breviaries was the poetical character of Responsories and Antiphons for local Saints. Let us take a few examples from the Aberdeen. The Antiphons on the Feast of S. Magnus, April 16, run thus :—

1. Magnus ex prosapia  
Magna percreatus,  
Actu vita moribus  
Major est probatus.

*Beatus vir.*

2. Prædis vacans promitur  
Pravorum instinctu  
Et Paulus convertitur  
In viæ procinctu.

*Quare fremuerent.*

3. Saulus ecce Paulus fit  
Prædo fit patronus  
Persecutor factus est  
Plebis Pastor bonus.

*Domine quid*

Sometimes we have them in hexameters, as in the Feast of S. Ursula and the Eleven Thousand Virgins :—

1. Purpureos flores cælesti rore madentes  
Decreto Domini famosa Britannia misit.

*Domine Dominus.*

2. In cunis positæ Baptismi fonte renatæ  
Et fidei veræ sunt legibus initiatæ.

*Cæli enarrant.*

3. Hæc pietatis amor sibi federat ordine miro  
Dum retrahit mundo festinat reddere cælo.

*Domini est terra.*

And sometimes the miracles of the Saints are thus related in a way which to us has rather a ludicrous effect. Thus, at Lauds, on S. Macharius's Day :—

1. Nullum dedit otio  
Tempus : vel orabat  
Semper vel colloquiis  
Divinis vacabat.

*Dominus regnavit.*

2. Fixo piscis gutture  
Dron osse vexatur;  
Sed ad Sancti subito  
Preces liberatur.

*Jubilate.*

Now, remember that this feast was a *duplex principale* at Aberdeen: *the* great day of the year, in fact (many of our readers will recollect the Cathedral of Old Machar). And then judge how greatly that Breviary stood in need of a thorough Reformation, when Lauds, as one of its highest festivals, began thus:—

- Ant. 1.* Never did he rest a whit:  
Either he was praying,  
Or in reading holy writ  
Pains and zeal displaying.

*The Lord is King.*

- Ant. 2.* In his throat a fish-bone lay;  
Dron was troubled greatly:  
But the Saint began to pray,  
And relieved him straightly.

*O be joyful.*

These rhyming verses are much more common in English and Scotch, than in Continental Breviaries. But Hexameters are also usual in German Offices. Take, for example, this specimen from the Cologne Breviary, on S. Lambert's Day. The Invitatory is—

Eternum trinumque Deum laudemus et unum,  
Qui sibi Lambertum transvexit ad æthera sanctum.

The Antiphons to the first Nocturn are:—

1. Orbita solaris præsentia gaudia confert:  
Præsulis eximii Lamberti gesta revolvens.

*Beatus vir.*

2. Hic fuit ad tempus Hildrici regis in aula:  
Dilectus cunctis et vocis famine dulcis.

*Quare fremuerunt.*

3. Sed post ut fidei devotus dogmata sumpsit  
Doctrinæ cumulos illi sapientia vexit.

*Domine quid.*

But both in our own and the German Breviaries the Responses are frequently in that singular half-dactylic measure, which was so great a favourite with Mediæval writers. For example, take those on the Feast of S. Blaanus, the Patron of Dumblane, and a *duplex principale* in that Church:—

- 1 R. Adolescens superno placuit  
Et se cunctis pium exhibuit;  
\*Unde cælum ingredi meruit.

- V. Vitæ verbum multis aperuit  
Atque vita beata claruit.  
Unde.
- 2 R. Domat carnis motus illicitos :  
Vincit mundi conatus noxios.  
\*Terit hostis antiqui tribulos.
- V. Manus mentem cordis et oculos  
Pie tendens semper ad superos.  
Terit.
- 3 R. O res mira! sceptrum despicitur  
Atque mundi decus contempnitur  
\*Et paupertas gratis eligitur.
- V. Et tota mente Christus diligitur,  
Ac pro Christo Corpus affigitur.  
Et.

It would be, as we have already hinted, an interesting inquiry to investigate the different Breviaries which, since the invention of printing, have been employed in the Church. We have often wondered that no such attempt has been made. We know that each of the following countries had its own family: (1.) Portugal, with perhaps seven different Breviaries; the chief, Lisbon, Evora, Braga, Santa Cruz de Coimbra. All these we have studied. (2.) Spain, with twenty-two which we could count up, and probably as many more which we could not; the chief, Toledo, Seville, Santiago de Compostella, Oviedo, Valença, Salamanca, and, in later times, Granada and Cordova. (3.) France, with more than a hundred and fifty different rites, each of these to be divided into the Mediæval and Reformed arrangements. Of the Reformed arrangement, its three chief families are Paris, Amiens, and Rouen. And to give some idea of its fecundity, we may mention that on the very table on which we are now writing, we once had seventy different Gallican Breviaries at one time. Then again, (4.) Germany, of the offices of which we do not pretend to an equal knowledge, but should divide them into the principal families of Cologne, Magdeburg, Salzburg, Cracow, Ratisbon. Next (5.) Denmark, of which perhaps Roskild and Sleswig are the only two remarkable rites. Then (6.) Norway, with its Trondjem Breviary; (7.) Sweden with its four; (8.) Lapland with its one; (9.) that which is now Prussia with five or six. Going southward—(10.) Italy; north, with five or six completely different families (we say nothing of Milan); Venice; Ravenna; Görz; Turin; also Switzerland, with the Genevan and Chur Uses. Of the south of Italy and Sicily, we say—for we are ashamed to say we know—nothing; but that there must have been several families here we can have no doubt. Add together the rites we have already counted up,

and then remember that they simply represent the secular aspect of the Church. We should after this have to enter not only into the various religious orders, themselves differing very widely from each other, as all from the secular Breviary, but into the national ramifications of those orders, which would make, for example, a Polish Premonstratensian Breviary utterly different from a Gallican Book of the same order; and then see what an enormous scope is open for Liturgical study, and that in a field in which absolutely nothing has been effected. We believe that the series of papers, of which this is one, in the *Christian Remembrancer*, is the only attempt which has been made, not only in England, but in Europe, at a commencement, however poor and imperfect—miserably poor and imperfect it is—of the science of Comparative Liturgiology (if we may borrow a term from anatomy). At all events, if there are any such European attempts, they have excited little interest, and produced no result. But that this science will be pursued, and to an extent of which we at present have little idea, we cannot doubt. We believe that, in due time, given a Festival, and one or two of its leading points—say gradual, collect, and post-communion—and the genus and class of its Liturgical family may at once be pointed out. For, while we look forward to almost inconceivable progress in this study, we cannot close our eyes to what has been already done. Fifty years ago it would have seemed incredible that, were a hymn which he had never seen before laid before a practised hymnologist, he would be able to tell you the nation of its writer, and the date, to say the least, within forty years on one side or the other. Knowing what has been done in the past, we may for the future—and we use the words in no irreverent sense—‘thank God, and take courage.’

---



ART. VI.—1. *Olshausen and Ebrard on the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

Edinburgh: Clark. 1853.

2. *Bähr's Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus.*

WE are taught in Holy Scripture that God Almighty has a certain Divine complacency in the works of His own hands. When the six days' labour of creation was accomplished, 'He saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very *'good:'* not merely good, but goodly; not only excellent for its proper ends, but also such as to possess the Divine Mind with a mysterious joy. For the Psalmist, after dwelling on the works of creation, as setting forth the glorious majesty of the Lord, adds, 'the Lord shall *rejoice* in His works.' So, too, we are told, that He 'rejoiced over'<sup>1</sup> His Church of old when He beheld it fulfilling His gracious designs in the formation of it. And this Divine joy must have reached a yet higher degree when in His well-beloved Son He beheld the Divine Manhood attaining to its utmost perfection, and said, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And now that by a subsequent act of loving-kindness and mercy He beholds mankind also as 'accepted in the Beloved,' doubtless it is still with delight ineffable that He contemplates the fruit of His unsearchable counsels: the glorious order and beauty of the Church as seen in Christ Jesus;—the mystical Body of His dear Son, making increase according to the heavenly laws of its being, 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'

It is probably owing to the affinity which exists between the Divine Nature and that of the higher orders of beings, that the contemplation of divinely constituted form and order has in it something naturally healthful to the rational soul and to the immortal spirit. When the Almighty Creator 'laid the foundations of the earth,' when He 'laid the measures thereof, and stretched out the line' of order and beauty 'upon it,'—then, we are told by the mouth of God Himself, a thrill of irrepressible joy and ecstasy passed through the hosts of heaven, albeit not unused to contemplate the Divine perfections: for 'the morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God *shouted for joy.*' And that contemplation added, we may well conceive, to the perfection after their kind, and not merely to the pleasures, of the angelic spirits. For they must have derived from thence such new conceptions of the Divine power and working as would

---

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah lxii. 5; Jerem. xxxii.

furnish a fresh theme for that unceasing adoration and service, the rendering of which is the very life of their being. Recognising, as in a mirror, in the material universe, the reflection of that order and harmony, that obedient working, which already reigned among themselves, and perceiving the beauty in which these resulted; they would be provided with fresh incentives, if such could be needed, to perseverance in the discharge of their duty. Certain it is that, at a later period, the range of their knowledge and the topics of their adoration were alike enlarged by the unfolding of the great mystery of the Catholic Church. That mystery 'had from the beginning of the world been hid in God,' hid even from the blessed angels; but then, at length, 'unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places was made known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God.'

And as even the holy angels are thus provided in the natural world with an object of contemplation, which, though of a lower sphere than theirs, it is good for them to look upon—as they are even sustained, it may be, in their perseverance, and advanced in their condition, by such contemplation—so is it, in a yet higher degree, with man. Nature is to us a parable of growth and of fruit-bearing under Divine influences; a parable of death and resurrection; a parable of ever-descending grace and of ever-ascending adoration. The animal world, too, reads us a thousand lessons of labour, of fidelity, of meekness,—'the ox knowing his owner, and the ass his master's crib;' 'the sheep that before her shearers is dumb;' 'the stork in the heavens knowing her appointed time, and the turtle, the crane, and the swallow 'observing the time of their coming.'

But it is not in nature only, nor even principally, that we are instructed by the Almighty to behold, as in a mirror, our position and our duties towards Him. The nature of the Catholic Church, its relation to its great Head, and His operation on its behalf, have all, from very early times, and by a distinct and peculiar act of Divine forethought, been traced in clear outline, though on a diminished scale, and in a lower sphere, in the ancient religious economies, though in the Mosaic more especially. Those forms of religion not only served their immediate purpose of keeping man near to God; they were also, as they progressed and were evolved, a *careful copy*, waxing ever more and more distinct and full, of that perfect religion which was to come in Christ Jesus. And doubtless they were so constituted for this among other profound reasons, that the subjects of the more glorious and perfect dispensation might, by perusing the features and the provisions of the earlier systems, understand their own privileges and duties. That this is so, is sufficiently proved by the fact that in the New Testament the New Economy is constantly

described and set forth to us in terms of the *Old*. The Holy Spirit, when He would convey to us a conception of the highest mysteries of Christianity, continually represents them in terms of the patriarchal and Mosaic systems. Most distinctly in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Revelation of S. John, but no less *really* throughout the New Testament, Christ is supremely and emphatically described as a *Priest*, and his work throughout its whole range as a *ritual* and a *sacrificial* one. His Body is at once a Temple and a Sacrifice, and He is a Lamb slain; and His life was a 'preparing' of that 'Body' for sacrifice; and His last act in life was the presenting of it as such; and his resurrection was the token and proof of its acceptance in that character; and his ascension and session were the carrying of it into the Holy of holies; and heaven itself, yea, the Lord God Almighty Himself,<sup>1</sup> is set forth as a wondrous temple for the perpetual presentation of it. And for the explanation of all these terms, of temple, and priest, and sacrifice; for the understanding of the effects of a religious system thus constituted, we are plainly referred to the accounts of these things contained in the ancient Scriptures, for there and there only do we find such a system drawn out for us, and seen in operation.

It is in perfect accordance with this conclusion, to which we are thus unavoidably led by the nomenclature adopted in the New Testament, that both the Mosaic scheme of service and the subsequent structure of Solomon's Temple were, avowedly, *copied* from that state of things, then future, but now, by God's mercy, gloriously present and in operation—the Church of Christ. For 'See,' said God to Moses, 'that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount.' And again, we read in the Book of Chronicles (1 xxviii. 11, *sq.*), that 'David gave to Solomon his son the *pattern of all that he had by the spirit*, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and for 'the courses of the priests and Levites, and for all the work of 'the service of the house of the Lord. . . . All this, said 'David, the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand 'upon me, even all the works of this pattern.' It is important that we should clearly understand *what it was* that was thus showed both to Moses and David, as the pattern and exemplar after which they were to arrange the services of the Israelitish Church. We say the *services*, for it is plain that neither Tabernacle nor Temple had any other use than as ministering to those services. It was *not*, then, as some might be ready to suppose, that *still future* state of things, which we look for, when this world shall have come to an end, and the Church shall have entered on her triumphant state in heaven. Not this, but the Church as she

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xxi. 22.

is at this hour, and has been ever since our Lord's ascension; the Church in her present state of warfare and expectation; the Church reaching from earth to heaven, and evermore working out her high destiny in accordance with the wondrous and supernatural laws of her being; with Christ for her High Priest, Heaven for her Holy of Holies, the Church in heaven and earth for worshippers in her courts, and the presentation of the One Sacrifice of Christ for her perpetual service. For so S. Paul assures us, speaking throughout of the then already present Church of God as being the thing which was showed to Moses, and after which the services were copied both in the Tabernacle at Mount Sinai and in the Temple in the Holy Mount at Jerusalem. 'Of the things which have been spoken,' says he, 'this is the sum: We have such an high priest,' such as Aaron in his operation, such as Melchisedek in his unchangeableness, 'who is set on the right hand of the Majesty 'in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true 'tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.' For, 'the priests, according to the law,' he proceeds, 'serve,' or minister, 'unto the copy and shadow of heavenly things; but Christ hath 'obtained,' and exercises continually, 'a more excellent ministry,' even that glorious and perfect ministry which Moses was enjoined to imitate.

It is certain, then, that in the religious ordinances and condition of the old world, though more especially in those of the chosen people, we may contemplate, imaged with the utmost fidelity, in a mirror spread out by the Hand of God Himself, our position in Christ; the whole form and features of His Holy Catholic Church. And it was intended that we should do so. Even as in the still older book of Nature, so too in the next to it in age, and superior to it in glory, the book of the Old Dispensation, may both angels and men find abundant matter both of delight and of instruction. So does S. Paul dwell with rapture on the privileges and position of the Israelites of old; 'To whom,' says he, 'pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, 'and the covenants, and the giving of the law, the service of 'God, and his promises;' and elsewhere he teaches us that even that 'ministration of death was glorious,' however much 'the 'ministration of righteousness might exceed it in glory.' So, too, when he would instruct us in the reality of that union and oneness which we have with each other and with Christ, through partaking of His Body and Blood, he desires us to 'behold Israel after the flesh,' and there to read, in the fact that 'they which eat of the sacrifices are' held to be 'partakers of the one altar,' the very image of that blessed, though myste-

<sup>1</sup> Heb. viii. 1—6.

rious verity. These significant suggestions of the holy Apostle it should be our care to act upon. And it is our purpose briefly to draw out the main particulars of the ancient Mosaic system, considered as a Divinely executed draught of the Christian economy. Such cannot be a profitless speculation. It is well-known (to adopt a familiar illustration) that the building up and completion of a most gigantic, but at the same time most unfinished continental cathedral, is now carrying on with an effectiveness and a certainty mainly due to the happy discovery of the original draught of it, setting forth in every particular the entire conception of it as it lay in the mind of the architect 500 years ago. And can we doubt, that the building up to completeness of that yet unfinished mystery, the Catholic Church (so wondrously left to human agency, under the eye of the great Master Builder, to accomplish), is then most sure to be after the mind of Christ, when we are careful to study well that wondrous draught and plan of it which, drawn out by the Divinely-guided hand of Moses, is indicated to us by the no less inspired finger of S. Paul?

It must be borne in mind, in the first place, that certain great and leading lines of that heavenly draught or copy had already, from the most primeval days, been laid down. Every ordinance of true religion imparted by God to man, from the very hour of the Fall, was unquestionably a copy, as far as it went, of the perfect scheme and constitution to come. The 'firstling lamb' of Abel's burnt-offering did not less truly copy a certain leading feature of the Christian economy, than did the corresponding offering in the Mosaic system. In one respect, indeed, it was a more exact copy, in that it set forth the Lamb as 'slain from the foundation of the world,' thus exhibiting the vast antiquity of the design of salvation, and its retrospective application to the redemption of the faithful in all ages. Again, in the mysterious person of Melchisedek, his ancestry all unrecorded, and himself coming forth to view, as it were, out of the recesses of one eternity, and entering into those of another (so passing is the glimpse we catch of him in the historic page of Holy Scripture), was set forth the Divine and eternal Sonship of the High Priest of the future economy; while the allegiance of Abraham, the father of the chosen people, to Melchisedek, correctly imaged and indicated the infirmity and imperfection of the Aaronic priesthood, the supremacy and perfection of Christ's.

And thus, 'when Israel came out of Egypt, and the house of Jacob from among the strange people,' already had the two great and cardinal features of the Gospel economy been disclosed—Sacrifice and Priest—some precious Thing to offer, a

prevailing and a Divine Person to offer it. But it remained for the Mosaic system to set forth many important particulars of the operation of the great future economy, and to complete the circle of conceptions belonging to the vast mystery of redemption and salvation.

The *sphere* in which this imitative scheme was to take effect and be exhibited had already been determined. A race had been separated and set apart for the purpose. Federally in the person of Abraham, and individually in that of his descendants, had a portion been chosen, and it as it were *carved out* from the general mass of humanity. By a kind of new creation had this race been formed and supernaturally privileged and endowed. And when it had experienced a shameful Fall—for such must the going down into Egypt and the sojourn there, taken in all their circumstances, be accounted—and when they had in consequence fallen under grievous bondage of body and soul—physical bondage to Pharaoh, spiritual thralldom to the gods of Egypt—then had a wondrous redemption from both been effected by the blood of a lamb. Thus was this race the peculiar possession of God by a twofold right; the right of quasi-creation (independently of the creation of the whole human family) and the right of redemption. And into the privileges of the redemption, both temporal and spiritual, thus effected, was every individual soul in that race solemnly admitted, first by sacramental participation of the lamb slain, and afterwards by baptism in the cloud and in the sea. The close parallel and resemblance of all this to the original from which it was divinely drawn, viz. the creation and fall of man, his redemption by the Blood of Christ, the participation of that Sacrifice at the very time by the first Apostles, and their subsequent baptism by the Holy Ghost into the privileges of the Christian estate, need hardly be pointed out.

But all this was, after all, only the introduction and inauguration of the race into a new relation towards God. It still remained to be seen in what way it would be taught to act and maintain itself in that relation, so as to accomplish the part destined for it. With this view an entirely new system of appliances and ordinances was now set on foot, consisting chiefly, however, in two main circumstances: a *new and an abiding Presence of God among them*; and a *continual presentation of them, by certain ordained means, in that Presence*. This, it is much to be observed, was altogether a new feature and phenomenon in the spiritual history of mankind. Somewhat, doubtless, had the world already known of the visible Presence of God on earth, even since the Fall. More especially had such Presence been vouchsafed to the 'first fathers of the holy seed,' Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.



Somewhat again, as we have seen, had they practised of Divine worship and service, of presentation of themselves to God, through the appointed and indispensable medium of sacrifice. But the Presence and the service had been both alike intermitted and occasional. Such a thing as a *perpetual, abiding Presence of God*, beyond that whereby He is present in all his works,—this had been hitherto unknown. Neither had the conception of *continued, unceasing Divine service and sacrifice* been entertained or realized. Both of these, then, it was the first care of the Almighty to provide in the newly enjoined system. The very charter, characteristic, and essence of it, as laid down in Exodus, ch. xxix. 38—45, was, that *they should, on their part, offer upon the altar a lamb, morning and evening, day by day continually*, with a meat offering of bread and wine: while, on his part, God declared that on the condition of their approaching Him through this medium, He would give his continual Presence and his Glory. ‘Now this,’ it was said, ‘is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day continually. The one lamb shalt thou offer in the morning; and the other lamb shalt thou offer at even: and with the lamb a tenth deal of flour mingled with the fourth part of an hin of beaten oil; and the fourth part of an hin of wine for a drink offering. This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout all your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by My glory.’

We have cited at length this ordinance of the Mosaic system, because of its vast importance, both as the very centre of that system in itself, and also as setting forth and interpreting to us, in some most important particulars, our position as Christians. We ought clearly to understand, otherwise we shall miss the true characteristics of the Israelitish and the Christian economy, what the purport of this peculiar Presence, and this continued sacrificial presentation, was.

First, then, as regards the Presence: it was, as we know from various circumstances attending it, an awful and majestic, but at the same time a hallowing and beatifying Presence. In these respects it was widely different from anything that we read of in the previous history of man, unless we may assume a visible Presence at the gates of Eden after the Fall. The appearance of a burning lamp, shown on one occasion in a vision to Abraham, was the nearest approach to it hitherto. But this, as well as that to Moses in the bush, was in truth the prelude and first manifestation of the Presence now permanently

vouchsafed. That Presence now became abiding; and it would seem to have been in all respects a strictly *kindred* Presence, both in its nature and effects, to that whereby the Almighty dwells upon the Throne of his majesty in Heaven. True to the wondrous character of the Mosaic economy as already unfolded, this Majesty, this Presence, was a copy of *that*. Not the Tabernacle itself only, nor the Temple itself only, but the Majestic Presence that dwelt therein, was, 'according to' the awful 'pattern,' or original, 'showed unto Moses in the mount.' Not that it attained in glory or excellence to that heavenly and transcending Presence. It was, as Hooker speaks, a restrained Presence; restrained in its glory, restrained in the sphere of its operation. 'He was present here,' says Ebrard, 'not as the 'Creator and Governor of the world (as such He dwelt in 'heaven), but as the covenant God of His people.' With this limitation, however, it was already true, and surely it was a glorious and a consoling truth, that 'the Tabernacle of God 'was with men, and He dwelt with them, and they were His 'people, and God Himself was with them, and was their God.' Heaven, for certain purposes, and to certain privileged persons, was now on earth, by a real removal and descent thither, according to a certain *mode of Presence*, of the Divine Glory. A present God, seated on a throne of mercy, might now be approached at a particular spot; a Presence for sanctification, for acceptance, and for blessing, abode in a holy place, was diffused throughout the chosen land, and gathered the favoured people 'under the covering of its wings.'

But, secondly, it is no less important that we should understand the purport of this continued act of *sacrificial presentation*, which was the correlative and the condition of the Presence above spoken of. And it was, as we learn from the original charter already cited, and from many circumstances of the system—it was the ordained means of the *actual and continual presentation before the Presence*, in a deep mystery, of the *whole people of Israel*. It was not merely a perpetual atonement for the sins of Israel, as regarded the covenant then present, though this it was. It was also a perpetual *presentation with acceptance, of the entire nation, on the basis of that atonement*. The lamb, in a deep mystery, represented, and in a manner contained, the children of Israel. When God looked upon it, He not only remembered his covenant and promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; He also beheld their seed accepted in it; cleansed by it; drawing near unharmed in it; rising in grateful clouds of incense, and in the accepted sacrificial flame; an offering made by fire of a 'sweet savour unto the Lord.' This was the original promise:—'There will I meet with the *children of Israel*.' And

yet how small a portion of the people, and on what rare occasions, could be present in person there! And again it was said (Ezek. xx. 40, 41), 'There will I accept you;' 'I will accept you with your sweet savour, and I will be sanctified in you.' The Tabernacle itself was called 'the Tabernacle of meeting,' (see Patrick): not, as we render it, 'of the congregation;' because of the continual Presence there, face to face, in a mystery, of God with Israel, and Israel with God. Thus was the great mystery of our real engrafting into Christ, and our presentation and acceptance *in Him*, the true Lamb, and as being of His Body, wonderfully copied and foreshown.

The same was indicated by portions of the *dress of the high priest*, who was to offer this sacrifice. He was a representative person in the deeper sense of that term; not merely as *standing on behalf* of the nation, but by a real, actual, though deeply mysterious presentation, setting them before God. For Aaron was to 'bear the names of the children of Israel both upon his shoulder and on the breastplate upon his breast, when he went into the holy place, to be a memorial before the Lord continually.' And 'the plate of pure gold upon the forefront of his mitre' was designed 'to bear'—that is, in a mystery to bring thither for atonement—'the iniquity' or imperfections 'of the holy things which the children of Israel should hallow, or offer;' . . . 'it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord.' Here again were the persons of the offerers gathered into the *person of their high priest*. In him they and their services were cleansed and accepted; a glorious copy, or 'type,' indeed, of the presentation of man in the person of Christ, as Priest no less than as Sacrifice.

Thus were the chosen people, taken as a whole, and, together with them, their land, and all that they possessed, presented continually before the Divine Presence in that form or mode in which it vouchsafed to dwell between the cherubims; and thus did a certain sanctification and acceptance, and blessings of a certain kind, flow out continually from that Presence. We say sanctification and blessings of a *certain kind*, for it must be well understood, as S. Paul is so careful to point out in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and elsewhere, that Israel was not hereby admitted to that cleansing and sanctification in body, soul, and spirit, which alone can fit man for appearing in the *majestic Presence of God in heaven*, and which Christ alone could supply. It was only a lower, a far lower degree or kind of access that was vouchsafed. The sanctuary was, by comparison, 'a worldly sanctuary,' after all, not a heavenly one; though akin to that in heaven, it was such a one as flesh and blood might, on certain conditions, enter into. In order to

Israel's appearing in that Presence unharmed, and not unharmed only, but so as to be blessed, consoled, and enriched by it, a certain mysterious power had been imparted to the sacrificed lamb, and to the action and service of the high priest and the altar. This sacrifice removed, as was manifest from the results, the unfitness of man to appear even in such a Presence as that: and hence this and other sacrifices are said, in the Books of Moses, to 'make atonement.' They did away with certain ulterior results or effects of sin. As S. Paul teaches, they 'sanctified to the purifying of the flesh.' Flesh and blood, touched with those remedies, *might* enter into a Presence, and into blessings, otherwise denied to them. But those remedies reached not to the conscience: they removed not the universal and as yet unalterable condition and consciousness of guilt and unfitness for entering into God's Presence in heaven. 'It was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin.' In their sphere, however, and for the purposes then contemplated, these sacrifices 'had power with God and prevailed.'

Here, then, in this great continual sacrifice, was set forth with the utmost distinctness, that which is at this hour carried on in the heavenly places. In the glorious system of the Catholic Church, Christ, the great High Priest, continually presents His sacrifice of Himself, once offered on the cross, in the very majestic Presence of God Himself. And in that sacrifice He presents, truly engrafted into His Body, and members of Him, both as Victim and as Priest, all those who are His. They already, in a deep mystery, 'sit together with Christ in the heavenly places.' There God the Father beholds them accepted in the Beloved. There their offering of themselves in body, soul, and spirit, is accepted, cleansed from all imperfection by union to the One Sacrifice. There their action as priests unto God is effective through their engrafting into the One High Priest. Nor only so. As all Israel, in their persons and in their land, were conceived to be, and really were, compassed about by the hallowing and protecting Presence, which had its peculiar seat upon the cherubim; as they were in all their relations and actions of life, a 'peculiar treasure' of God's, and 'a holy people;' as they were blessed 'in the basket, and in the store, in their going out, and in their coming in,' because of the Presence in which they mysteriously stood, through the continual burnt offering; even so is it, only to much loftier purposes, with the faithful now. The ever-reiterated truth which rises so continually to the lips of S. Paul, that they 'are in Christ'—that Christ who is ever presenting Himself before the Father—this truth makes all their actions and relations to be hallowed

and dignified indeed; since whether they eat or drink, buy or sell, they are now ever more accepted with the Father.

But there remains one more feature of Israelitish service which we must take into the account, if we would thoroughly comprehend, in its entire range, either that dispensation or our own. Though this great continual Burnt-offering was the centre and essence of the system, the secret and the vehicle, so to speak, of the Israelites' continual acceptance before God, and of all the blessings which they enjoyed as his people; yet the benefits of it were not enjoyed, nor indeed was the system itself complete, apart from the active and obedient co-operation of the people. As the high priest offered *in the name* of the people, and as carrying them upon his heart before God, it was expected and required that their devout assent and hearty desires should go along with the offering priest and the offered sacrifice. For this purpose it had become the religious practice of the nation to make use of the particular hours of sacrifice as hours of private and congregational prayer. 'At the hour of incense' and sacrifice, the people were found 'praying without,' not only, as we know from the New Testament, at Jerusalem, but at a distance from it, as the instance of Daniel abundantly proves. Through that one sacrifice they prayed; in that sacrifice they offered themselves, not mystically only, through the person and mediation of the high priest, but personally, by their own will and their own prayer.

But this was not all. They were empowered and required to unite themselves to that sacrifice, and to appropriate the benefits of it, not merely by acts of the will, by pleadings and by prayers, but also by actually *partaking*, after a divinely provided and deeply mysterious manner, of the sacrifice itself. That all Israel should literally and physically eat of the *one* lamb daily offered on the altar, was of course impossible. But it was ordained, pursuant, no doubt, to certain ancient laws of sacrifice, that they should from time to time bring a lamb or other offering of their own. This being slain, and the choicest part laid, to be consumed by fire, *upon the one sacrifice*<sup>1</sup> which was kept burning slowly all day for the purpose, the remainder was eaten with joy and thanksgiving by priest and people. And by this means they were held and conceived to eat, and to all practical intents and purposes they did eat, of the one lamb and the one sacrifice; and by the same means they had mysterious *convivium* and communion with God Himself; the part consumed upon the altar being called His 'food' and His 'bread.' To this it is that S. Paul plainly alludes, when he says of 'Israel after the

<sup>1</sup> See Lev. iii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. iii. 11; xxi. 6. See Patrick *in loc.*

flesh,' that 'they which ate of the sacrifices were partakers of the altar'—that is, manifestly, of the one sacrifice upon the altar—for hereby his argument implies, they all became one body.

Thus did they thrice in the year at least, at their great feasts, and at other times of their own 'voluntary will,' make solemn and thankful remembrance before God of the one original Passover sacrifice of a lamb, by which they had been redeemed unto God, and plead in the most prevailing manner the virtue and powers of it;—unite themselves afresh to the great continual offering;—lay themselves, in a mysterious but wonderfully real manner, upon the altar for dedication and acceptance, and receive from the altar, through the medium of the one priest and sacrifice, all the blessings of the covenant.

It is impossible that anything should more accurately copy and foreshow the means by which, under the Christian dispensation, men were to make remembrance of, and plead in the most prevailing way, the once offered but continually presented Sacrifice of Christ, unite themselves afresh to it, lay themselves in a mystery on the heavenly altar for dedication and acceptance, and receive from that altar, through the One Priest and the One Sacrifice, all the gifts and blessings of the new and perfect covenant.

The one great difference—setting aside the more glorious and eternal purposes of the Gospel ordinance—is that the material things now presented on earth, are no longer slain victims, but the pure and simple elements of bread and wine, themselves also made much use of under the old system. In and by these, mysteriously identified by our Lord's own words with His Body and Blood, as the personal and congregational offerings of the Israelites were identified with their continual offering, Christians have that wondrous and glorious 'communion' of which S. Paul speaks; they 'dwell in Christ, and Christ in them, are one with Christ, and Christ with them;' and in Him, and with Him, they offer and present, in the true Holy of Holies, their souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto the Father; and in Him and with Him are accepted.

We have desired, in these remarks, to draw attention to a much-neglected portion of Holy Scripture,—the Mosaic ordinances,—as a divinely provided source of instruction and illustration, respecting some important and often controverted features of the Christian economy. And surely the view here given tends to elevate as well as quicken our conceptions of that glorious work in which clergy and laity, in their different degrees, are admitted to co-operate with their High Priest in heaven. It is plain they assist *continually*, in all their actions, though especially in their religious ones, at a lofty and glorious solem-



nity: a solemnity which even the continual sacrifice and service of the Mosaic high priest and people,—with all its splendour and array of appliances and mysteries, its awful Presence, its inscrutable Holy of Holies, its heaven-descended fire, its wondrously empowered altar and sacrifice, its mysteriously vested and commissioned priest, its prevailing incense, its gorgeous Tabernacle and Temple, its unvalued gold, its vast powers to sanctify, to enrich, and to bless the subjects of it,—can but very faintly image forth to us. They can take up, in a sense which Israel never knew, the words and the songs, the religious position and action of Israel. In ‘the tranquil operation of that great mystery the Church,’ they behold with their eyes things which (with the single exception of Moses) ‘eye had not seen, neither ear heard, neither had it entered into the heart of man to conceive; but which God had prepared for them that love Him.’ With Heaven for their Holy of Holies, Christ for continual Sacrifice and Priest, His Heart for their Altar, His Spirit for their altar-fire, angels and ‘the Holy Church throughout the world’ for worshippers, Holy Eucharists for presentation of and union to the One Sacrifice, and holy deeds of faith and love for offerings,—they chant, as a Church, a ceaseless *Te Deum* to the Divine and Heavenly Majesty, in the Presence of which they are admitted, in Christ, continually to dwell.

II. We would now direct the attention of our readers to another and widely different field of speculation, connected with the Mosaic system, or suggested by it.

The question as to the existence on our globe of some pre-Adamite race of human beings, has at various past times been entertained, with little profit, by the curious and the learned. Geology would seem to have set that question at rest for ever. But however that be, there is a somewhat parallel and much more practical inquiry, which may, for aught that we see, with all sobriety and orthodoxy be entertained, viz. as to the religious dispensation under which mankind were placed in the interval between the dispersion of nations and the call of Abraham. For, though it is commonly assumed that we are told in the Old Testament all that God has ever done in the way of communicating the knowledge of Himself to man, it must be confessed that this is far from being self-evident: neither does the Bible, that we are aware of, anywhere affirm it to be the case. Indeed, one justly favourite view of the matter has always been, that the particular design of the Old Testament was to place on record only so much of God’s ancient dealings with man as led up directly to His manifestation of Himself in the flesh; and that, with this intent, the

religious fortunes and conditions of a particular branch of the Noachian stock, the Shemitic, and those of a particular family in that branch, the Heberite (or Hebrew) and Abrahamitic, were almost exclusively treated of. We confess to being of this opinion ourselves. We venture to think it rather probable than improbable, that there were revelations of Himself by God to man between the flood and the call of Abraham. Who can contemplate, more especially with a thoughtful gaze, the DISPERSION—that strange and touching spectacle, of embryo nations, smitten with penal dumbness one towards another, and sorrowfully separating, under a Divine instinct, to seek their several homes and seats far away from the cradle of the race;—who, looking on this, can forbear to surmise that the grief of that second Fall may have been soothed, and the peril of it to true religion diminished, by some special revelation or provision, over and above the universally inherited system of sacrifice which was handed down from Noah? The guardianship of the knowledge of the true God; the more especial priesthood of the now scattered race; would these be unlikely to be committed to some family or nation as their peculiar depository? There is no reason why they might not; and we propose now to gather together whatever indications of such a fact can be brought to bear upon the subject from the Biblical records, from historic sources, and even from recent exhumations of the ancient life and religion of Eastern nations. It will be found that one or two puzzling questions, as to the antecedents of the Mosaic Economy, receive a satisfactory solution, if the existence of such a pre-Abrahamic revelation can be fairly established.

The subject has been incidentally mooted in a very able paper in the 'Journal of Sacred Literature' for April last.<sup>1</sup> We shall venture to avail ourselves of the writer's ingenious suggestions; and we conceive that by following them out farther than he himself has done, a very strong case may be made out for the existence of a religious dispensation, committed to a particular branch of the family of Noah, ages before the time of Abraham, and closely resembling as to its essential structure, and even in some very singular respects, the Mosaic system.

It is well known, in the first place, that, in the opinion of many commentators, the Scriptures lend considerable countenance to the belief that Mount Horeb derived its title of the 'Mount of God' from its having been favoured with Divine

---

<sup>1</sup> Sinai, Kadesh, and Mount Hor; or, a Critical Enquiry into the Route of the Exodus. By H. C.

revelations previous to the call of Moses. The words addressed to him from the burning bush, 'The place whereon thou standest is holy ground,' seem to point, not uncertainly, to such a conclusion. Mount Horeb is called the Mount of God four times: 1. When Moses leads his flock thither; 2. When Aaron, by God's command, goes to meet him on the occasion of his solemn mission (Exod. iv. 27); 3. When Jethro comes to see him, and offers sacrifice; 4. When Elijah flees thither. Now all these were, in various degrees, high and solemn religious occasions, ordained by God Himself to take place at this particular mount. Horeb, in all these instances, was the cradle and starting-point of great religious transactions. In the case of Elijah, the Almighty was pleased, in the abeyance of Jerusalem, the new 'Mount of God' (now become unsafe as a refuge for the prophet), to fall back, as it were, upon the earlier seat of manifestation of Himself, and to make it the starting-point of a new era in the history of His people. Not the Law only, but the Prophets, date in a manner from Mount Horeb, and received their initiation and inauguration there. It may be observed, too, that it is not said 'Sinai,' but 'Horeb.' It may, no doubt, have been the Sinaitic peak of the Horeb range. But the name is generic, and sends us back to the pre-Exodic times, when *Horeb* was as yet the Mount of God, and Sinai was not yet named in the history of Divine manifestations. We venture to assume, then, on these grounds, the fact of Mount Horeb's having been honoured with some Divine revelation or other previous to the call of Moses, and that it was in consequence familiarly known at that date as 'the Mount of God.' We see, too, from the history of Elijah, that it retained that title—now further secured to it by the Sinaitic revelations—for ages after the occupation of Canaan by the chosen people.

Our next fact is, that in a highly curious and hitherto very unsatisfactorily explained passage of Holy Scripture, a certain people is said, on a most probable interpretation of the Hebrew text, to have had the guardianship, on some 'holy Mount,' of a peculiar religious dispensation. We subjoin, with one or two corrections, and reinstatements of our Authorized Version, the translation given in the paper already mentioned.

## EZEKIEL XXVIII. 11—19.

- 11 And the word of Jehovah came unto me saying,
- 12 Son of man, raise the funeral lament over the King of Tyre, and thou shalt say to him, Thus saith Jehovah, my Lord,
- 13 Thou wast the express image of perfection, (cf. Heb. i. 2.)  
 Full of wisdom, perfect in beauty:  
 In Eden, the garden of God, didst thou dwell:  
 Every precious stone was thy covering (or, canopy):

- The sardius, topaz, diamond [LXX. smaragdus],  
 The beryl, onyx [LXX. sapphire,] jasper,  
 The sapphire, emerald, carbuncle, [LXX. ligure, agate, amethyst,]  
 [The chrysolite, beryl, onyx, so LXX. inserts] and gold.  
 The minstrelsy of thy tabrets and of thy pipes  
 Was prepared for thee in the day thou was created.
- 14 With [so LXX. *μερά* Heb. *מֶרַח*] the anointed covering cherub,  
 And I placed thee in the holy mount of God.  
 Thou wast in the midst of the rocks of fire: thou didst walk up and  
 down (or dwell familiarly there).
- 15 Perfect wert thou in thy ways from the day thou wert created,  
 16 Until by reason of thy vast traffic iniquity was found in thee.  
 They filled thee with violence, and thou sinnedst:  
 And I cast thee as profane out of the mount of God:  
 And the covering cherub destroyed thee out of the midst of the rocks  
 of fire.
- 17 Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty.  
 Thou didst corrupt thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness:  
 Upon the earth I cast thee, before kings have I placed thee,  
 That thou mightest become a gazing-stock.
- 18 By the multitude of thine iniquities, by the sin of thy traffic,  
 Thou didst defile [LXX. Thou profanest] thy sanctuaries.

On this passage we cannot do better than give our author's comment:

'It has been usually supposed that this prophecy was addressed to some actual king of Tyre. This we believe to be perfectly impossible. Tyre, from its first foundation on the Syrian coast, was always so pre-eminently idolatrous that no king of this Baal and Astarte-worshipping city could ever have merited the praises here bestowed by Ezekiel upon the primitive orthodoxy of the object of the prophecy. Nor could there ever have been a period when the Syrian Tyre could have deserved the title of the "guardian cherub of the holy hill of God." The worship of Baal was contemporary with the foundation of the city. The temple of this deity was as old as the city itself. The fervour of idolatrous bigotry and superstition never seems to have been intermitted in any period of Tyrian history. Ithobal, "the man or servant of Baal," was a favourite name of the kings; and this appears to have been actually the name of the very king who was reigning at the time of the prophecy of Ezekiel. Nor would it be easy to understand to what part of any territory, ever possessed by the Syrian Tyre, the name of "the holy hill of God" could be applied. But assume that the Tyrian people is here typified under the figure of its king, and that the commencement of the first stanza relates to the innocent youth of the Phœnician nation, when they inhabited the Negeb (to the south of Palestine), and when Mount Sinai was the great gathering-place of their religious assemblies, and the whole prophecy becomes clear and intelligible.

'The concurrent testimony of sacred and profane history proves the Phœnicians to have been a Cushite colony from Chawilah, on the Persian Gulph, who first settled in the Negeb, and were afterwards transferred, by the Assyrians, to the Mediterranean coast, south of Lebanon. In the early days of their settlement in the Negeb, they cultivated the pure worship of Jehovah, which they had brought from the yet uncorrupted parent nation of Chawilah. Afterwards, enriched by a lucrative commerce, by sea, with India, and pampered with the luxuries of Egypt, Canaan and Syria, which they obtained in exchange for the commodities of Ind, like Jeshurun, they "waxed fat and

kicked," and began to prefer the idol gods of Egypt to the eternal Creator, whom they had previously worshipped in spirit and in truth. Then the power of the guilty nation was broken; they were cast, as profane, from the mount of God, and dispersed from the Negeb, a situation unrivalled in the world for a maritime people. The Assyrians, then masters of Syria and Canaan, compelled or induced them to remove to the northern coast of Syria, and to transfer their traffic from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean. The agency of the Assyrians in this removal may be proved by a passage in the prophecy of Isaiah against Tyre (chap. xxiii. 13) which has hitherto much vexed translators and commentators, and not less the modern writers of Oriental history. In this prophecy Isaiah predicts the destruction of Tyre by the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar. He addresses the merchants of Tarshish or Tartessus, in Spain, as the richest and most flourishing of the Tyrian colonies, inhabiting the Peru of the ancient world. After the manner of the prophets, he bids these children of Tyre to sound the funeral lament over the parent-city.

"Wail, ye ships of Tarshish," exclaims the prophet, (the ships being here taken figuratively for the merchants,) "for Tyre is laid waste." Using the present tense for the future, Isaiah places the whole scene vividly before his readers. We see, in the picture conjured up by his glowing words, the Sidonians and all the neighbouring nations gazing in speechless astonishment on the ruin of the Queen of the Sea. Then, to dash down the pride of the conqueror, and his confidence in his idol deities, the prophet inquires, in a tone of superb disdain, "Who has taken this counsel against Tyre?" "Jehovah of Hosts!" he replies triumphantly, "he has given command against the merchant city, to destroy the strongholds thereof." He then turns to the Chaldeans, and pursues his argument, that the ruin of Tyre is really brought about by the hand of Jehovah. "Verily, oh land of the Chaldeans; this people (the Tyrian) was not till the Assyrian assigned it (Tyre) for a seat for the Tziyim; they raised up its watch-towers, they erected its palaces, and he has appointed it for ruin. Wail, ye ships of Tarshish, for your strength is destroyed."

The word Tziyim, used generally, may be applied to the inhabitants of any dry region; but used in a definite sense, as is clearly the case here, it applies to the inhabitants of the Negeb, the Tziyah being that "dry region," which, lying immediately to the south of Judah, was most familiar to the Jews. The inhabitants of the Tziyah, or Negeb, immediately before the foundation of Tyre, were certainly the Phœnicians; and the Phœnicians, with equal certainty, were a Cushite, and not, as is vulgarly supposed, a Canaanite people. Hence the writer of the eighty-seventh Psalm speaks of the Tyrians as Cushites, "Tyre the people of Cush"; for the Masoretic punctuation, making it Tyre *with* "Cush," seems to admit of no rational application.

Recurring now to the passage from Ezekiel, we cannot fail to be struck, in the first place, with the loftiness of its general tone, and the strength and splendour of some of its expressions. The titles, 'The express image [lit. seal] of perfection; full of wisdom; perfect in beauty,' seem to bespeak the object of them as one on which some especial reflex of the Divine brightness had been cast. The ἀποσφράγισμα ὁμοιώσεως καὶ στέφανος κάλλους of the LXX. in this place may well remind us of the ἀπαύραγμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The illumination of a special revelation, or the guardianship of a peculiar sanctuary and seat of God's Presence, would account, as perhaps nothing

else could, for the Almighty's applying such exalted titles to a nation.

Next, what do we find assigned as the seat and locality of such a Presence as we are supposing to be referred to in the passage? No other than the 'Mount of God' (vv. 14, 15); here called, moreover, though here only, the 'holy Mount.' Of the identity of the 'mount' thus indicated with Mount Horeb, there can be, after what has been said, no reasonable doubt. And the single intimation here given of the character of the mountain, or of the mode of God's revealing Himself on it ('thou wast in the midst of the rocks of fire'), accords thoroughly with the religious history of Mount Horeb. The revelations of God to Moses and Elijah, the burning bush, the appearance on Sinai, the wind breaking in pieces the rocks before the Lord, the earthquake, the fire—all belong to a region and a sphere to which the language, 'in the midst of the rocks of fire,' might most fitly be applied.

Here, then, the supposition is, were the Tyrians, at an earlier and purer stage of their history, blessed with a peculiar Presence of God, signified by the abode among them of 'the covering cherub' (v. 14)? We have here ventured to depart from our Authorized Version, from the Masoretic punctuation and vowels, and from our author, and to take the LXX. rather for our guide; so that the Tyrian nation is not addressed as 'the cherub,' but is said to have 'dwelt with the cherub,' or to have had the cherub dwelling with them. The received version looks suspicious, it being unusual, as is well known, to find **אנ** used for 'thou' in the masculine, instead of the usual form which, indeed, has just preceded; so that the LXX. is probably right in rendering it 'with the cherub.' Now it is by this time sufficiently agreed among Biblical scholars, what the nature and import of the 'cherub' or 'cherubim' is. 'The cherub,' says Bähr (*Symbolik* i. p. 341), 'combining in itself the most perfect kinds of creaturely life, is the most complete manifestation of God and of the Divine life. The powers of life, which are divided among the creatures that occupy the highest place in the visible creation, are in it combined and individualized.' Where the cherub or cherubim is—for its multiform shape and nature cause it to be pluralized at pleasure—*there* is a special manifestation of God's Presence and glory. Nor only so, but of that Presence and glory considered as a means of sanctifying the creature, and as receiving the creature's homage and worship. The majesty of God is represented in Holy Scripture, probably from Genesis to Revelation, certainly in Psalm xviii. 2, as being borne upon the cherub or cherubim. It is, therefore, no light thing that is here predicted of the Tyrian nation in its earlier days, that it was 'with the cherub.'



And there arises at once a presumption that there was, as the correlative of this cherubic Presence of God, some system of worship. 'Without assuming,' says the writer already quoted, 'any complete system of religious ceremonies to have existed, such as is prescribed by the Mosaic law, we may take it for granted that there was at least some general outline of religious worship directed and observed.' And on closer examination, we seem to find assigned to the 'cherub' in this supposed older system the same functions as were discharged by the cherubim overshadowing the Mosaic ark, for it is called the 'covering cherub.' Now this was the exact attitude and function of the Mosaic cherubim. The Divine Presence being seated upon or above them, they 'covered' the ark, and with it (according to one view) the sins of the people, committed against the Law contained in the ark, from the Divine wrath. Such, at least, is the confessed signification of the mercy-seat or cover of the ark; and it may with much probability be extended to the cherubim also. But in any case the wings of the cherubim were certainly conceived to 'cover' and shield the people of God from harm, as appears from many places in the Psalms; especially 'I will dwell in thy Tabernacle for ever, and my trust shall be under the shadow of Thy wings.' We know, moreover, that in the Mosaic Law the ark and the entire tabernacle were ordered to be anointed (Exod. xxx. 26); and the cherub, in our passage of Ezekiel, is called the 'anointed cherub.' It is more probable, however, as we conceive, that the word 'anointed' here signifies designation, rather than material anointing. If we may judge from the tenour of the whole passage, the manifestations here spoken of by Ezekiel consisted of the actual and visible cherub or cherubim themselves, as in Ezekiel's own earlier visions, and in S. John's; *not*, as in the Mosaic Tabernacle, of the Divine glory in a cloud, accompanied by merely material and imitative, though Divinely prescribed cherubim. For we read (v. 16) that the covering cherub personally drove out or 'destroyed' the sinful people among whom it had dwelt hitherto. And here we may observe that we seem to be borne out in departing once more from the Authorized Version, and following the LXX. rendering 'he destroyed' (*ἐξήγαγε*, compare Gen. iii. 24); the Hebrew verb being properly in the third person. This 'driving out' by the cherub is strikingly parallel to the expulsion of our first parents from Paradise, and lends additional veri-similitude to our view of the entire passage.

We seem in the next place to have some glimpse given us of the housing or tabernacling of the cherub or cherubim, which thus dwelt of old among the ancestry of the Tyrian people, in the words (ver. 13), 'Every precious stone was thy covering.' It

would be impossible to insist upon this as signifying something of a religious or ritual character, rather than a mere regal canopy, were it not for one extraordinary circumstance connected with the enumeration of precious stones which follows immediately. It is this; that the names and arrangement of the stones are even in the Hebrew text very nearly, in the LXX. *exactly* identical, with those of the stones in the mystic breastplate of the Mosaic High Priest. The main difference, as may be seen by comparing our passage with Exod. xxxix. 9, 13, is that in the Hebrew text of Ezekiel, the third row of stones in the Mosaic list is omitted; and that there are one or two transpositions, as a glance at our rendering will show. Otherwise the distribution into rows of three each, and the names of the stones, are marvellously coincident. But it is scarcely less remarkable that the LXX. supplies the missing row, and so exhibits perfect accordance, stone for stone, with the Mosaic arrangement. We are entitled to affirm from hence one of two things, either that the LXX. exhibits the true text of Ezekiel, in which case the anticipation of the Mosaic or Shemitic by the Cushite or Hamitic system is complete; or else, which is more likely, that the LXX. interpreters, struck with the correspondence, even in the Hebrew text, supplemented and corrected the text of Ezekiel so as to accord with that in Exodus. And in that case the hypothesis which we are supporting, as to a previous dispensation akin to that of Moses, proves to be no novel idea, but one which had forced itself upon the LXX. interpreters two or three centuries before the Christian era. For we have already seen that they uphold throughout, by their version, the view which makes 'the cherub' to be not the king or people of Tyre, but a cherubic presence dwelling among those of old time in their former seat. And now we see them, in full accordance with this view, recognising, in the ornaments of the cherub's covering or canopy, the mystic jewels of their own Aaronic High Priest. In any case, we find another striking point of correspondence, be it more or less full, between the ritual provisions of the supposed older system and those of the Mosaic. And here, too, as in the matter of the cherubim, the feature which we observe holding a place in both the systems, is one which reappears in the final visions of S. John. For the 'twelve stones' of the Aaronic breastplate are seen once more, with little change or transposition, in the twelve foundation-stones of the New Jerusalem. (Rev. xxi. 19, 20.) This indicates a deep and real mystery belonging to these stones. And we cannot be far wrong in conceiving that in the primeval system we are contemplating, they discharged some mysterious functions corresponding to the Urim and

Thummim oracular mystery of the Aaronic breastplate. We might further conjecture that if the Hebrew text is to be stood upon, the characteristic number of that system may have been nine, not, as that of the later one, twelve. We should not omit to add that the resemblance of the two lists of jewels is completed by the express mention of their being, in both cases, set in gold.

If now we may be permitted, on the strength of what has been advanced, to assume the existence of certain ritual and mystic appurtenances to the supposed cherubic Presence, namely, a canopy or tabernacle, adorned or provided in some way with precious stones, set in a mysterious order, and carrying in them some Divinely-ordained significance and powers; we shall have less hesitation as to the meaning to be ascribed to another feature in this curious fragment of primeval religious history. 'The minstrelsy of thy tabrets and of thy pipes' can, in such a context, mean nothing else than music as an accompaniment to religious services. Nor are any musical instruments mentioned earlier in connexion with religious minstrelsy than tabrets, or timbrels, and pipes. The timbrels of Miriam and the Israelitish women; the psaltery, tabret, pipe, and harp of the company of prophets in the days of Saul, will occur to every one. And thus we obtain (*si sana omnia*) a distinct intimation of acts of praise forming part of the ceremonial. The characteristic instrument, moreover, of the Mosaic system was the trumpet, first heard at the awful scene of the giving of the law, and perpetually ever after at the Sabbaths and new moon festivals. This probably arose from the warlike character of the deliverance achieved for Israel at the Red Sea (Exod. xiv. 3). It was emphatically as 'the Lord of Hosts,' and as 'a Man of War,' that God had taken Israel to Himself. And it is perhaps not devoid of significance that in the more ancient system, which we are employed in deciphering, only the less martial instruments of tabret and pipe are found mentioned; no such warlike display of power having occurred in its history.

But enough of the probable or possible details of this primeval system. It is time that we should endeavour to give some answer to a question which will naturally rise to the lips of the reader, viz. whether Holy Scripture lends any countenance, beyond what may be elicited from this passage of Ezekiel, to so startling an hypothesis as that of a well-defined religious ceremonial system previous to the Mosaic dispensation? for it may fairly be argued, that if such a dispensation had ever existed, it were strange that it should enjoy no other recognition than this single one.

We proceed, therefore, first, to point out some probabilities, based upon the dealings of God with the human race, as recorded in Scripture, that such a previous dispensation should have been given, and given to the very people who, according to our view of the passage in Ezekiel, were the depositaries of it. And then we shall collect some passages which, to say the least, become far more intelligible on the hypothesis of such an older dispensation, than on any other.

We remark, then, that in God's dealings with the family of Abraham, the principle of primogeniture, though accompanied with the possibility, and indeed sometimes with the Divine foreknowledge, of forfeiture, is fully recognised. Thus Esau was indeed ultimately rejected, as had been foreseen and pre-signified. But he was put upon his trial first. The forfeiture was by his own fault. And even in the case of Ishmael, his actual rejection was, humanly speaking, caused by his mockery of his younger brother Isaac (Gen. xxi. 9). Indeed, it may be truly said, there is a mystery in primogeniture (arising, probably, from its reflecting the position and prerogatives of the Only Begotten Son), which insures its not being lightly set aside by the Eternal Father. Now, applying this to the case of Noah's sons, it becomes *à priori* probable that the eldest son, or the eldest branch, would be entrusted, in the first instance, with the priesthood of the world, and with the custody of any special religious dispensation under which men were to be placed at such an epoch as the dispersion.

But which *was* the eldest of Noah's three sons, or what the order of their birth? This, it is well known, is a question not easily resolved with certainty. But by far the most probable opinion, we conceive, is that which makes the order of birth to have been Ham, Shem, Japhet: Shem being uniformly placed before Ham in the Biblical enumeration of them, only on account of his pre-eminence, not of primogeniture. A very similar case occurs later in Scripture; the three sons of Levi being, in order of birth, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari: but Kohath's family obtaining, in some instances, the first place (*e.g.* 2 Chron. vi. 33), on account of Moses and Aaron having sprung from that branch. The supposition, on the other hand, which would make the order of birth to have been either Japhet, Ham, Shem; or Japhet, Shem, Ham, is so far improbable, that it then becomes very difficult to account for Japhet's obtaining the *last* place in the customary Biblical enumeration. Why should so complete a disturbance of the natural order be made, as that the eldest should be placed last? We should be surprised to find Gershon placed last among the three sons of Levi.

It is true that there are one or two passages which seem to make Japhet older than Shem; such is Gen. x. 21, rendered in our version: 'Shem, the brother of Japhet the elder'—a rendering slightly favoured by the Hebrew, and adopted by the LXX., Patrick, and others. But the contrary version, 'Shem, the elder brother of Japhet,' is sanctioned by the Arabic, Syriac, and Vulgate versions, and by many more recent authorities. It is true, again, that Japhet's posterity are enumerated before Ham's and Shem's in Gen. x.; but this may perfectly well be accounted for by the Hebrew habit, so much brought out by Lowth and Jebb, of taking things up in the reverse order to that in which they have been mentioned just before. Thus, the chapter having begun, 'These are the generations of Noah; Shem, Ham, Japhet,' it was natural to a Hebrew writer to proceed to enumerate first Japhet's sons, then Ham's, then Shem's. And the sacred historian seems himself to have been anxious to remove the erroneous impression which this reversed order would be likely to leave on the mind of the reader, as to the comparative seniority of Japhet and Shem: for it is here that, when he comes to speak of the posterity of Shem, he inserts the explanatory clause just referred to, 'Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of 'Eber, the elder brother of Japhet, even to him were children 'born.' The whole sentence seems designed to secure for Shem his due estimation and position, not only as father of the chosen people, but also as being senior to Japhet, notwithstanding that his genealogy had been placed last, and Japhet's first. Shem, therefore, we venture to conclude, was older than Japhet. And since he was certainly not the eldest son—for Noah began to have children at five hundred years old, whereas Shem was not born till his father's five hundred and second year (Gen. xi. 10; vii. 6)—it follows that the order of seniority was Ham, Shem, Japhet.

This point being settled then, and Ham and Shem thus acknowledged as the first and second sons of Noah, the usual order of the Divine procedure in after times would lead us, as has been already said, to expect that the custody of any special religious dispensation would be committed to the eldest brother's family in the first instance. And such, according to the hypothesis we are examining, is the case. The Tyrians were Cushites, or descendants of Cush. Now Cush was (Gen. x. 6) the eldest son of Ham, the eldest son of Noah. Moreover, the Tyrians were, strictly speaking, Havilites, or descendants of Havilah, and were locally, and perhaps nationally, mixed up with the Sebaïtes, or descendants of Seba. But Seba and Havilah, again, were the two eldest sons of Cush. And thus the

theory we speak of assigns the primary religious æconomy at the dispersion to exactly the right family.

It is true that this supposition runs counter to a widely prevailing opinion that Ham was utterly disinherited, *ipso facto*, for his irreverence to his father. We have already pointed out, however, that, judging by the analogy of later instances, it was one thing with the Almighty to destine a family to disinheritance, and quite another to inflict it immediately. And that Ham was not degraded in his own person, and at once, from all benefits of primogeniture, appears from hence, that in the distribution of the earth at the dispersion, his descendants obtain the fairest portion, nearest to the site of Paradise, and apparently including the country of Eden itself. The two first-named of the four rivers which took their rise in the garden, or which met there, are Pison, 'which compasseth the whole land of *Havilah*,' and Gihon, 'the same that compasseth the whole land of *Cush*,' or Ethiopia. Ham, then, was certainly not disinherited as regarded earthly possessions. But it may be thought that 'the accursed race of Ham' must still be unlikely to receive a *religious* dispensation. It is, however, a mistake to speak of Ham's race as accursed. It was, for whatever reason, *Canaan*, the fourth son of Ham, that was cursed, not Ham;—'cursed be Canaan,' probably because he had instigated the act of irreverence. And when it is said that 'Noah knew what his younger son had done to him,' this, as is now generally admitted, means 'his grandson,' viz. Canaan.

And now let the reader observe how exactly the particulars mentioned in our passage of Ezekiel are in correspondence with what we read of *Havilah* in Genesis. 'In Eden, the garden of God, didst thou dwell,' says Ezekiel to the Havitite Tyrian nation. The first river that 'went out of Eden to water the garden,' in the primitive days, became in after times, and was still in the days of Moses, the boundary of 'the whole land of *Havilah*.'—Ezekiel makes great mention of the precious stones and gold of the Havitite sacred canopy, or tabernacle, or whatever it was. Moses informs us, that 'the gold of that land' (*Havilah*) is good; there is the bdellium (probably the pearls 'of the Persian Gulf') and the onyx-stone.' The onyx and the gold, we may remark, are in immediate juxtaposition in the LXX. version of Ezekiel.

Thus is there no difficulty in the supposition that a religious dispensation may have been anciently entrusted to the family of Ham: a presumption arises rather that it would be so. And the location which, on a literal interpretation of Ezekiel, had at one time been assigned to the depositaries of their religion, namely, the country of Eden, while it exactly accords with the



record in Genesis, is also the most natural one for the purpose, as being near the ancient seat of God's presence.

However, the families both of Cush and of his son Havilah took, as we know, a wider range at the dispersion. Cush, as the great Bochart has abundantly proved, had his proper seat, not, as is vulgarly supposed, south of Egypt, (though his race afterwards spread thither,) but in Arabia. Havilah, as has been already said, settled in the Persian Gulf, but detached a colony, the Phœnicians of later ages, to the comparatively small tongue of land south of Palestine; the scene in after ages of the Israelitish wanderings. And the theory of the author whom we have been following is, that this particular detachment of the Hamitic family had the especial guardianship, and even the exclusive knowledge, of the ancient religious system on Mount Horeb. We are disposed somewhat to enlarge upon this theory, so far as to suppose that the knowledge of this dispensation, and the worship involved in it, was common to the two elder branches of Ham's descendants, viz. Cush and Mizraim. So that the holy mount was the centre of worship to the wide band of kindred nations extending from the Persian Gulf to Libya. Our author has dwelt with great force upon the facilities which such a situation as that of Horeb would afford for the commerce of the favoured nation, on account of its lying in the direct track of the great caravans which, no doubt, from the very earliest times, traversed the Negeb. But the range of that traffic was so immense, that there is no difficulty whatever in supposing that it may have been the means of centralising the periodical worship of all the countries from Libya to Persia upon the holy mount of Horeb. 'The chief element of religious worship would,' with great probability, as our author remarks, 'be the meeting or assemblage of the whole nation'—(why not of the many nations along the route?)—'at the great festivals.' And he proceeds, with much ingenuity and plausibility, to identify the ancient Horeb with a mountain in the very centre of the Negeb (or Sinaitic tongue of land), now called *Jebel-el-'Ojmah*; a manifest corruption of an Arabic term for 'mount of assembly.' It is well known that Lord Lindsay did much to shake the identity of Sinai with the mount commonly shown as such, viz. *Jebel Mûsa*. Nor does Dr. Stanley's suggested substitution of *Râs Safsâfah*, a promontory in front of it, remove the immense difficulty of conceiving how two or three millions of persons could encamp and manœuvre within the narrow defiles of this granitic region. The claims of Mount Serbal are open to the same objection; and we are disposed to think our author's proposed substitution of *Jebel-el-'Ojmah*, as the true Sinai, exceedingly probable. It rises to a great height above

the rest of a long range of hills stretching across the region. At its base is a long belt of sand, the only sand in the Negeb, of seventy miles in length, by twelve in breadth; and in other respects, the site answers perfectly to the requirements of the Bible narrative. And it would make no less convenient a centre for such vast Panhellenic religious assemblies as we are supposing.

According to this view then, the reader will observe, the two great families of Cush and Mizraim—that is, the Egypt and Ethiopia (= Arabia, &c.) of Scripture—enjoyed, from the time of the dispersion, not merely, in common with the rest of the nations, the knowledge of the true God, but also an august system of worship. The cherubim, and with them the sanctifying Presence of God, dwelt for them, perhaps visibly, on Mount Horeb; as of old, probably, at the gates of Eden, and as in after ages on this very mount, in Mosaic days, and finally on Mount Sinai. Of this dispensation, ‘with its anointed and covering cherub,’ or cherubim; its richly adorned canopy; its mystic rows of jewels; its minstrelsy of tabrets and pipes; above all, its manifestations of God in power and majesty amid ‘the rocks of fire;’—of this, we say, were the Tyrians of old the guardians, serving as a kind of priesthood to it, while the worshippers were the two great kindred nations, or families of nations, Cush and Mizraim, or Ethiopia and Egypt. At some time previous to the call of Abraham, the supposition is, this worship had become corrupted. Egypt on the one hand, Ethiopia on the other, had betaken them to other deities: professing probably to be worshipping still the one God, only in ways of their own, but really substituting for Him their own imaginations. And finally, the Havilites themselves, the guardians of the sacred mount, were removed, by God’s decree, and by means of the Assyrians, to their final seat at Tyre.

Now all this will read, it may be, somewhat strangely at first sight, and perhaps be deemed a wild and baseless theory. But so it is that, account for it as we will, there is a whole class of passages of Scripture which, on the simplest interpretation of them, recognise a *previous Divine dispensation as having been given to Egypt and Ethiopia*, and a rejection of those nations as depositaries of that system of worship in favour of the race of Abraham; while in some places a kind of comparison and rivalry seems to be distinctly instituted between the elder and later seats of the Divine Presence.

The first of these passages is Isaiah xliii. 3. In a context, manifestly referring to the history of the race at large, to its original election and adoption, and not to any merely passing deliverance from invasion, it is said, ‘Thus saith the Lord, that

'created thee, O Jacob, that formed thee, O Israel; I am the 'Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour; I gave 'Egypt (Mizraim) for thy ransom, Ethiopia (Cush) and Seba for 'thee; since thou wast precious in my sight thou hast been 'honourable, and I have loved thee; therefore will I give men 'for thee and people for thy life.' In vain do the interpreters seek for any subsequent and passing historical events which fit into this remarkable declaration. Whereas it is literally true, on the hypothesis we have been advocating, that Egypt and Ethiopia were rejected in the same sense, and to the same purposes, as those in and for which Israel was accepted. It will be remembered that Tyre, in our passage of Ezekiel, is said to have been 'created' (*i. e.* as a nation)—'Thou wast perfect in the day that thou wast created'—exactly as Israel's 'creation' is spoken of here. Take again the 87th Psalm. The ancient Jewish arrangement of it, in which Hammond concurs, makes the present first clause to be a title, 'The foundation or founded city, concerning holy mounts.' The mention of 'mounts' in the plural is very unsatisfactorily referred by Hengstenberg to a mountain range. The Psalm is manifestly a comparison of the glories of different 'holy mounts,' with a preference for and exaltation of Zion above others. 'The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all tabernacles or dwellings, O Jacob' (or, than His successive dwellings, at Shiloh, &c. in Jacob). Then, in language of some obscurity in detail, but of which the general drift cannot be mistaken, the pretensions of Ethiopia and Egypt are weighed and found wanting. 'Rahab and Babylon,' *i. e.* Egypt and the region towards the Persian Gulf, are named; then, 'Philistia (an Egyptian colony) and Cushite Tyre, or Tyre with Cush.' But of Zion alone can it be said that 'it is the highest honour to be born there;' 'the Most High establishes her' (compare the title as rendered above). We cannot but think that much light is thus thrown upon this confessedly obscure Psalm. And the reference at the close to 'singers and players on instruments' reminds us forcibly of the 'tabrets and pipes' of the Cushite worship.

But again, in Amos ix. 7, a passage resembling that from Isaiah already quoted, asserting God's universal dominion and free election of Israel, we read, 'Are ye not as the children of 'the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? Have I not 'brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines 'from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?' Why 'as the children of the Ethiopians?' unless that God had once regarded them as He now regarded Israel? This passage also has sorely vexed the commentators. Take again Zephaniah iii. 3, where the same kind of comparison seems to be instituted as in Psalm

lxxxvii. as above rendered. God announces His determination to reassemble all nations, and bring back 'the pure language' of the days before the dispersion (ver. 9); 'that they may all call upon the Lord with one consent. From beyond the rivers of *'Ethiopia* my suppliants, even the daughter of my dispersed, 'shall bring mine offering.' Is not this far better understood of God's yet more ancient people than of Israel? or has it not some reference to them? The promise of restored unity of worship is at least very much to our purpose. 'And thou shalt no more be haughty,' the prophet proceeds, 'because of my holy mountain.' Is not this, again, an anticipation of the announcement of our Lord, 'Ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at [the mountain of] Jerusalem, worship the Father?' Sion was no more to boast herself, as now, over discrowned *Ethiopia*, nor *Ethiopia* to bewail her rejected 'mount' of Horeb; there was to be a pure and united worship for all, in the mountain which should fill the whole earth, in the mystical Body of Christ.

Once more—for the instances crowd upon us—take that much-discussed apostrophe in Isaiah, ch. xviii. 1: 'Woe to the *'land shadowing with wings*, which is beyond the rivers of *'Ethiopia*.' Rejecting a thousand and one interpretations of this, we cleave to that in which Bochart once more leads the way; viz. that the '*Ethiopia*' is the Arabian region, not that to the south of Egypt. And we take 'the land shadowing with wings' to be, as a commentator expresses it, 'O thou that boastest thyself in the shadowing power of thy wings,' and refer it to the Divine protection, the 'covering cherub,' which was her glory of old time. The next chapter concludes with a promise of bringing in this nation, fitly described as 'a nation terrible, or to be feared, in their beginning,' but now 'scattered and peeled, meted out, and trodden down,' by God's rejection of them. The succeeding chapter makes the like address to Egypt, and ends with a magnificent promise of the restoration and union into one holy nation of the great three, 'Egypt, Assyria, and Israel;' Assyria having now succeeded to the seats and (as we shall see reason presently for asserting) to the corrupted worship of the ancient Cushites. 'The Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance.' So again, (and it is the last passage we shall adduce), we have the same remarkable linking together of Egypt and *Ethiopia* in the matter of religious restoration, in Psalmi lxxviii. There, too, occurs once more the comparison of the 'mounts of God' with each other: Sinai and Sion are compared (15—17), and Sion declared to be equal to her rival in point of the Divine Presence and inhabitation. The 'goings of God in the sanc-

tuary' in the midst of 'the singers and players on instruments,' and specially of 'the tabrets or timbrels of the damsels,' are here again, as in Psalm lxxxvii. and in Ezekiel, dwelt upon. And it is announced, as the crowning feature of Sion's destined exaltation, that the depositaries of the more ancient dispensation should come in and do homage at Jerusalem; that 'princes should come out of *Egypt*; *Ethiopia* should soon stretch 'out her hands unto God.'

But we promised that our hypothesis should be shown to derive support from the searching investigations which have taken place in modern times into the history and antiquities of Eastern nations. Nor is there any difficulty in making our promise good; and we can at the same time remove a somewhat serious stumbling-block out of the path of the honest investigator of Mosaic antiquities.

It will be remembered that the leading and central feature of the Cushite worship, which it shared with the Mosaic, was the presence of the cherub, or cherubim. Now, there is scarcely any point connected with Oriental antiquities which has come out more prominently into view, or been more fully established, than the existence of cherubs as a feature of the ancient worship, both of Egypt and Assyria. First, as regards Egypt. Notwithstanding the arguments of Bähr, Hengstenberg<sup>1</sup> has established beyond all dispute, that the Egyptian sphinxes were, to all intents and purposes, *cherubs*. A cherub, as defined for us with the utmost certainty by Ezekiel and S. John, is a mystic creature, combining the characters of the four higher orders of animals—the man, the domestic animals, wild beasts, and birds; specifically the features of the man, the ox, the lion, and the eagle. That it is not necessary, however, that *all* these features should co-exist in every case to constitute a cherub or cherubim, appears from hence, that Ezekiel in one place ascribes to it only two faces, of a man and of a lion (xli. 18—20). This may have arisen, as Lightfoot conjectures, from two faces only being seen at one time. But the Mosaic cherubs, again, as far as we can judge, had only the body and face of a man, and the wings of a bird. Now, the Egyptian sphinxes, certainly, had, as a rule, 'the bodies of lions with human faces.' In other cases, the head of a ram (a domestic and sacrificial animal), or of a hawk, is substituted. It is somewhat remarkable, certainly, that the ox should not appear in the Egyptian combinations, but this is a minor circumstance, and may have arisen from the honours ascribed to the ox as a detached object of worship. It is impossible to deny to these 'creaturely combinations' all the essential characters of cherubim.

<sup>1</sup> Egypt and the Books of Moses, pp. 153, &c. Ed. Clark, 1845.

And with our Cushite dispensation to fall back upon, we can see at once how the Egyptians became possessed of such cherubic forms, ages and ages (as the monuments testify) before the Mosaic times. They had made to themselves imitations of the divinely ordained cherubim, the invisible symbol of God's Presence at their ancient seat of worship on Mount Horeb; and thus we surmount an otherwise insuperable difficulty as to the origin of the Mosaic cherubim. Hitherto, no one has been able to answer the weighty charge brought against the Mosaic system of having borrowed its leading ideas from Egypt. The vast learning of Spencer long ago built up this charge into a formidable shape, and modern Egyptology only confirms it; *unless* we suppose a prior existence, prior even to Egyptian monuments, of the cherubic form and idea, both in the Divine Mind and in the religious experience of the world. But now the whole difficulty disappears. Egypt had not invented the cherubic idea or shape. Moses was not indebted to a debasing idolatry for the form in which, under Divine guidance, he cast the symbols of the Divine Presence. God's good and glorious gift of cherubic presence and forms had been corrupted and perverted; it was only set in its ancient place again when it appeared in the Mosaic system. The same may be said of the Urim and Thummim. 'The Egyptian reference contained in 'the Urim and Thummim,' says Hengstenberg, 'is peculiarly 'distinct and incontrovertible. The high priest among the 'Egyptians wore round his neck, as superior judge, an image of 'sapphire, called *truth*;' or, as Diodorus says yet more exactly to the point, 'an image of costly stones, suspended upon a gold 'chain. After both contending parties had opened their case, 'the high priest must touch one of them with the image of 'truth.' The LXX. seem to recognise the relation, by rendering Urim and Thummim, 'light and truth.' Moreover, the two figures on the Egyptian breastplate were Re and Thmei, the resemblance of which to the Hebrew terms is very striking. In a word, the agreement is undeniable. But here, too, Egypt had, no doubt, derived the entire idea from the ancient and pure system under which she had grown up. Moses was only instructed to reinstate the mystic jewels, which, as we have seen, characterised the permanent worship in Horeb, and may have been placed, even there, on the breast of the high priest or the judge. And this is the key to a vast number of other coincidences which have been pointed out between the Mosaic and the Egyptian religious institutions.

Turn we now, in the last place, to the other great branch of the Hamitic family, who shared with Egypt the ancient worship of Horeb, or was the principal party to it. It has



been observed by Hengstenberg,<sup>1</sup> that 'of all the people with whom the Israelites were closely connected, only among the Egyptians are compound animals found: *i. e.* cherubs.' This is not exactly true. We know by this time that even Egypt was far outdone in her attachment to cherubic or compound forms in connexion with religious worship, by another nation, though by one only, the Assyrian; or, to speak more generally, the Mesopotamian race. The 'winged bulls,' which we have learnt so much of, and seen with our own eyes, are, in the strictest and fullest sense, CHERUBS. The head of a man, the body of a lion, the feet of a bull, the wings of an eagle, bespeak them 'cherubs' of the most perfect development; and the extent to which they characterised the religion of that people need not be insisted on. Now, whence to this nation, through what family of the stock of Noah, did the cherubic forms become thus familiar?

Among the very latest discoveries of modern research is this—and it seems to be fairly established—that, at a certain very early period, the inhabitants of Nineveh and the neighbouring cities, where these cherubic remains are found, were not, as has been hitherto supposed, Assyrians (Asshurites), of the family of Shem (Gen. x. 22), but *Cushites*, of the family of Ham. The name of Chushan-Rishathaim, King of Mesopotamia, who invaded Palestine in the time of the first Judges, suggests a Cushite dynasty: and this is confirmed by the monuments. The well-known ivories found by Mr. Layard at Nimrūd are confessedly neither Assyrian nor Egyptian, but quasi-Egyptian, and might well have proceeded from the kindred Cushite race. But further, he found, 'on the Khabour river, winged bulls, differing considerably, in treatment and style of art, from those found at Nineveh, with an archaic feeling, conveying an impression of *great antiquity*. The countenance had a peculiar character, differing from the Assyrian type. *The nose was flat and large, and the lips thick and overhanging, like those of a negro.*' These, as a recent writer<sup>2</sup> has observed, 'are the well-known features of the Cushite race;' and he sees no reason 'why he should hesitate to ascribe these monuments to the period of their predominance in Mesopotamia.' This discovery is entirely to our purpose. It seems to establish for us that the Assyrians received the cherubic or winged-bull forms from their Cushite predecessors; and thus we obtain a result in perfect harmony with our theory, and are enabled, at the same time,

<sup>1</sup> Egypt and the Books of Moses, p. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Journal of Sacred Literature, April, 1860, 'Nimrod and his Dynasty,' a clear and able paper.

conversely, to cast a most interesting light on the recent Assyrian discoveries.

We have only to add, that other considerations, which we cannot here enter into, further confirm the existence of Cushite predominance in Mesopotamia in early times. They appear on Egyptian monuments as invaders. Berosus, the Chaldee priest, enumerates nine Arabian (Cushite) kings who reigned at Babylon from about B.C. 1518. Lastly, the Babylonian works, published by Professor Chwolson, and described in a recent number of this Review, represent a Canaanitish dynasty as having possession of Chaldaea long before the well-known Assyrian times. But since the founder of this dynasty is actually named Nimrouda, or Nimrod (a descendant of Cush), and since the translator of the ancient Babylonian documents published by Chwolson habitually changes ethnical names into those current in his day, it may yet prove that, as an able writer maintains,<sup>1</sup> this newly discovered source of primitive Chaldaean history places a Cushite and not a Canaanitish race on the throne of Chaldaea as early as the time of Joseph.

---

<sup>1</sup> Journal of Sacred Literature as above, p. 74.

- ART. VII.—1. *On Physical Affections in connexion with Religion, as illustrated by Ulster Revivalism.* By the Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, M.A. London: Journal of Mental Science. July, 1860.
2. *The Year of Grace. A History of the Ulster Revival.* By the Rev. WILLIAM GIBSON, Professor of Christian Ethics. Belfast.
3. *La Mystique Divine, Naturelle et Diabolique.* Par GÖRRES, Traduit de l'Allemand par M. CHARLES SAINTE-FOI. Tomes I. II. III. IV. V. Paris: Mdme. Ve. Poussielgue-Rusand, Rue Saint-Sulpice, 23. 1854.
4. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1 Février, 1860. *Des Etudes Nouvelles sur le Somnambulisme.* Par M. ALFRED MAURY, de l'Institut.
5. *Histoire du Merveilleux dans les Temps Modernes.* Par LOUIS FIGUIER. Tomes I. II. III. Paris: Librairie de L. Hachette, Rue Pierre-Sarrazin, No. 14, 1860.
6. *The Religious aspect of Ulster Revivalism.* By the Rev. W. M'ILWAINE. Journal of Mental Science. October, 1860.

ABOUT six months ago we directed the attention of our readers to Irish Revivalism. It is always an unpleasant task to play the part of a religious detective; but in addition to the ungraciousness of the task, every man who has been called to fulfil such a duty, and who looks into his own heart with severe introspection, will find that his own moral and spiritual nature has been exposed to peculiar danger. There is the risk of colouring instances with an exaggerated hue of darkness, for the purpose of producing an effect. There is the temptation to take a miserable pleasure in the iniquity, whose very existence establishes a theory, and fulfils a vaticination, and whose presence is therefore in some degree a testimony to one's penetration. There is the danger of acquiring a habit of scrutinizing the character and conduct of religious men with a suspicious malignity; and there is the still subtler peril of shaking off the fine and delicate bloom of a man's own spiritual character, by handling roughly feelings and emotions which might have produced a tenderer devotion, but which one has learned to associate with morbid self-deception.

It is some satisfaction for us to remember that we wrote at the call of duty, and with the fixed determination rather to understate than to exaggerate such facts as were necessary to elucidate our position.

It was proclaimed last summer that all, or a vast majority, of

the revival cases were of the most hopeful character. Certain religious newspapers were crowded with wonderful histories, each ending with an assertion that none of the converts had relapsed. Let us state two simple facts for which we can vouch.

No. 1 we will call the case of A. T. This was a nurse in a clergyman's family, a woman of a soft and affectionate disposition, and of hysteric temperament. Her failing was a tendency, at long intervals, to tipping, not, however, amounting to drunkenness. In August of last year, this woman, who had never attended any meetings, but who was cognizant of all that was going on, was suddenly seized with 'convictions.' She rocked to and fro in a paroxysm of distress, crying 'My sins! my sins! O how black they are!' The physical seizure became rather violent, with pains in the stomach, and a feeling of tightness across the chest. In the course of two or three days this was followed by declarations of 'deep peace.' Expressions were used which an experienced pen could have moulded into a 'most lovely' tract. 'Now I see the beauty of the plan of salvation. Now I understand why the missionaries go to preach the Gospel. It is the love of my Saviour. Sometimes I think that I could go and declare His love to all the world; then I think it best to keep quiet.' Our informant, far as he was from being a revivalist, was really impressed with a conviction that genuine good was at work, and treated A. T. with sympathy and tenderness. His satisfaction at first was only marred by an uncomfortable feeling that there was too much confession of sinfulness in the abstract, too little of sin in the concrete. After a few months an unhappy moral deterioration set in. A. T. from being a tippler became a drunkard, and is now married to a Romanist.

No. 2 is the case of a young girl, who was violently affected, and whose letters were so quiet and earnest, evincing withal such tender concern for her parents and friends, that the strong feelings of her clergyman on the general unreality of the movement were considerably modified. It but too soon appeared that she was *pregnant* while penning these very epistles.

We could multiply these instances. We might mention that in one town all the street-walkers, who had been paraded as converts, went back to their unhappy trade. We could tell of madness, of idiocy, of epilepsy, of suicide, all resulting from Revivalism; but we pause in the revolting task.

Only let us answer the question which may be put: 'Why do you dwell upon these wretched instances? Why do you not rather seek for that which is good and promising?' We reply, In the solemn interest of truth itself. We must not lie, even for God. It is not honest, it is not religious, to conceal the sores that are festering in a hundred parishes. More espe-

cially when a new doctrine is percolating the atmosphere of the Church herself—when *salvation* is identified with certain morbid physical and mental phenomena—is it a bounden duty to record such cases as we have here chronicled, that men may confront their fancies with the stern evidences of fact. The cases above cited all come up to the revival standard of conversion. What are they worth after all?

Nor, while we speak of Revivalism as a system, and deprecate its introduction into the English Church as a permanent agency, would we wish to speak with bitterness, or otherwise than with sympathy, of some who threw themselves into the movement, and of others who were affected by it. Some of the former, we believe, were actuated by the best and purest motives: nor need we doubt that a blessing rested upon their intentions. When we heard of one under 'conviction' kneeling down late at night under the canopy of heaven, with a Methodist preacher, upon the wet grass, and wrestling with God till, as he believed, he received an answer of peace, we hailed an earnestness at least which made us ashamed. We have spoken here and there to ignorant, simple creatures, who have told us that they went to the meeting for a blessing from Christ, and got it; and one, at least, spoke with such simple, childlike joy, that we could scarcely refuse to mingle our tears with his. One lad we know, whose character has been much improved; certainly he continues to be struck still, Sunday after Sunday, to the inexpressible annoyance of the congregation with whom he worships, and will insist that each fit makes him holier, and brings him nearer to Christ, while we are equally sure that he will soon be an idiot. But of his moral improvement there can be no doubt. Such as these can scarcely help saying in their hearts to the Revival—

'Whate'er thy birth,  
Thou wert a beautiful thought, and softly shadowed forth.'

And had writers upon the Irish Revival used the slightest discrimination in choosing out their cases for publication; had they honestly and manfully pointed out the delusions, and in some cases abominations which accompanied the religious excitement; had they refrained from unctuous declamation against all who differed from them, and from claiming Divine authentication for Presbyterian doctrine and non-episcopal orders, we should have written in a different tone.

Commending our readers for ampler satisfaction to Mr. McIlwaine's articles—distinguished alike by fearless honesty and manly piety—we willingly pass from such details as these to the expression of a wish that what may be termed Thaumaturgic Psychology were thoroughly studied, from a point of view at once Christian and scientific, by men sufficiently conversant with theo-

logy and with mental science. The psychological condition of the prophets before and during the act of prophesying, is susceptible of reverent illustration from Holy Scripture. Such facts, for instance, as the attunement of Elisha's spirit by the playing of the minstrel—or the practice, remarked by Cornelius à Lapide on the first of Ezekiel, which led the prophets to the side of rivers, as if on purpose that their minds might drink in the freshness and music of the waters—depend upon psychological laws. The psychological law of prophetic inspiration, which has been generalized from a careful induction of particulars, that representations are projected before the prophet's mind as in a timeless picture, and that hence events separated by centuries appear to touch each other, with an effect like the beautiful optical illusion which seems to make the moon actually touch a forest or mountain, throws a flood of light upon the expression which has perplexed so many commentators.

'Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven.' The opposite class of facts—possession, and the wild and fanatical distortions which accompanied heathen sacrifices—would open out another chapter in human nature. Mediæval and modern times would add many authentic materials.

We propose to offer some scanty and hastily-collected contributions to Thaumaturgic Psychology, always with more or less reference to the alleged supernatural aspect of Revivalism. We shall commence with some remarks upon the prophetic *afflatus*, making free use of the 'Dissertation on Prophecy and the Prophets,' by John Smith, of Cambridge, to which Hengstenberg owes so much of his famous chapter on the Nature of Prophecy. We shall then draw together instances, mediæval and modern, in which psychological states have been superinduced, which have been supposed to be supernatural, and more or less akin to the ecstatic and prophetic phenomena of the Scriptures. We shall have the assistance of Görres from the Roman point of view; of Figuier, as an acute and sceptical man of the world; of Maury, as an accomplished physiologist. In conclusion, we shall lay down some principles which are important in the present day, as a safeguard against prevalent errors, and which tend, as we think, to illustrate a true spiritual psychology.

I. It is expressly stated in Scripture that there are different degrees of the prophetic *afflatus*. 'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners,' spake in time past unto the fathers by 'the prophets.' According to R. Abbo, we can distinguish psychologically four grades of prophetic *afflatus*. In the first

<sup>1</sup> πολυτρόπως. Cf. Deut. xxxiv. 10; Numb. xii. 6-8.



the imagination is predominant. The scene is too clouded for the reason to discriminate accurately the forms of spiritual truth. Parables, similitudes, and allegories, are prevalent. Zephaniah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, are specimens. This is the state of prophecy, as it wanes to its sunset, when the western horizon of the Jewish Church blazes with the expiring glory of the prophetic illumination. So Ezekiel exclaims: 'Ah Lord God! they say of me, Doth he not speak in parables?' In the *second* mode, the intellect and the imagination are equally balanced. In the *third*, the intellect is superior. In the *fourth*, the image of truth is not refracted as far as the imagination, but hangs in the serene air of pure intellect. The Jews thought that all this was implied in the palmary text of Numbers: 'If there be a prophet, I will make myself known unto him, in a *vision*, and will speak unto him in a *dream*.' In other places, as in the prophecy of the Pentecostal outpouring in Joel, visions and dreams are used as co-extensive with prophecy. 'Your sons and your daughters shall *prophesy*; your old men shall *dream dreams*; your young men shall see *visions*.' So of the lying prophets in Jeremiah. 'The prophets prophesy lies in my name; they prophesy unto you a *false vision and divination*.' The prophetic dream was apparently a continued dream, in which impressions were made on the imagination or intellect. The prophet seemed to be awake, and to discharge his usual functions, though all was scenic or dramatic. The Jews preferred the vision to the dream; but the former seems, as it were, to have glided into the latter. Thus: 'The word of the Lord came unto him in *a vision*; and when the sun was gone down, a *deep sleep* fell upon him.' S. Paul's words in the thirteenth of First Corinthians seem to agree with this view. 'Now we see through a glass darkly.' He compares the highest illumination here with the great vision hereafter. He uses the prophetic vision, the glass, to denote the hieroglyphics and emblems, which were just the mode in which impressions were made on the imagination.

These observations afford a basis for distinguishing between counterfeit and genuine presentments of prophecy. The counterfeit are *confined* to the imagination. As Smith justly adds, 'The power which actuates enthusiasts adds vigour only to the imagination, but does not illustrate the reason, nor carry it on to the true intellection of things as they mutually cohere and are connected. Hence they easily embrace things *absurd to all in possession of true reason*.' This then is the great difference between the true prophetic and the pseudo-prophetic spirit. Mental alienation is never produced by the Holy Spirit, who has His seat in the rational faculties. The pseudo-prophetic spirit, when it seizes any one, and is not

simulated by human craft, seems incapable of rising above the middle region of the soul, and remains there veiled in mist and cloud. It resides in the more earthly portion of our mental and moral nature, the emotions and the imagination. The Prince of Darkness cannot enter the sphere of light and reason, to rule the region which belongs to the Father of Lights. There is a serene and lucid heaven in the human soul, where Lucifer cannot abide, and whence he falls headlong when he strives to ascend it.

The greatest writers of antiquity take this view. It is precisely that which is adopted by S. Chrysostom, in his distinction between the wildness of the *μάντις*, and the waking discursive power, the sobriety, and the self-restrained consciousness of the *προφήτης*.<sup>1</sup> We think an analogous distinction will hardly fail to commend itself to those who have witnessed the Revival visions in Ulster; who have seen the cases in the lunatic asylums; or who are acquainted with the frantic cries and gesticulations that frequently, up to the present date, interrupt the Presbyterian preachers, and drive them to denounce in 1860 what they blessed in 1859.

II. We now proceed to the consideration of some instances, in which psychological conditions of an unusual character have been manifested, and for which a supernatural origin has been claimed.

A perfect and very curious repertory of such instances will be found in the 'Mystique' of Görres. Originally a politician of the most liberal stamp, at twenty-three years of age he became Professor of Natural History at Coblenz. To this professional study he added an immense range of philosophy, moral and political, and of Oriental learning. About his forty-fourth year, a 'Mission' preached at Strasburg, made him a 'convert' to ultramontaniam certainly, but as there is good ground for believing, to something deeper and truer also. From that time, for a period of sixteen years, his studies were devoted to the philosophy and physiology of mysticism, true and false. He published a monograph on Swedenborg and his visions, as a prelude to the more gigantic work, which he was preparing. The 'Mystique' soon appeared, an immense and ambitious undertaking. Some portions of this work are excessively difficult; laying, as it does, the basis of mystical phenomena in the anatomical and physiological condition of man. Even prejudice must concede that the arrangement of the book is philosophical, that the compass of reading which it displays is marvellous, and that the instances from which he rises to his *axiomata* are collected with a lavish profusion

<sup>1</sup> Homil. XXIX. in 1 Ep. ad Corinth.

from every nook and cranny of his object-matter. Yet, assuredly to most educated and thoughtful men, even of his own communion—and much more to English Churchmen—he will generally appear merely *cum ratione insanire*. The opening portion of the first volume is worthy of the writer's reputation. It is founded on sound historical study, and is tinged with an exquisite poetical colouring, which does not interfere with massive philosophic strength. But the image falls off from a head of gold to feet of clay. Görres exhibits that singular unevenness, which is to be found in Moehler, Dr. Newman, and the best writers of the Roman Communion, in whom broadness and philosophic statement of general principles are so often strangely united with more than childish helplessness in details. Witches, ghost stories, apparitions, vampires, succubi, and incubi—all are fish that come to his net. The volume on the 'Mystique Diabolique' is a sort of solid system of old wives' fables, and is pretty much on a par with Mr. Robert Dale Owen's 'Footfalls on the Boundaries of another World,' or Mrs. Crowe's 'Night Side of Nature.' The study of the volume, however, may be of service to a discriminating reader. We are not, perhaps, mistaken in thinking, that a candid perusal may both open out remarkable *aperçus* into certain obscure psychological conditions recorded in Holy Scripture, and also illustrate the lower phenomena of Revivalism. Nor should we accuse the man of superstition who, upon a careful survey of these five volumes, should confess that some portions, at least, are so extraordinary as to defy explanation upon the hypotheses of MM. Figuier and Maury. Görres himself was solemnly convinced of the importance of his work. He believed that new manifestations of infernal power were at hand, similar to those of Pagan antiquity. 'My book will appear in time,' he said. We proceed with a rapid analysis of the work.

*Mysticism*, Görres says, is rooted in our Incarnate Lord. This life hidden in Him He communicated to his Church on the day of Pentecost. The Acts and Epistle to the Corinthians in the New Testament; outside it, in Christian antiquity, Irenæus, Justin, and Origen, especially, testify to the continuous outpouring and onflow of this wonderful life. Over against this growth of holiness stands a correspondent growth of evil. Whilst the Spirit of God sheds His rays of warmth and light on His bride, the Church, the spirit of nature, in this supernatural spring-tide, seemed also to awaken out of its slumber. Hence, in various quarters, and especially among the Gnostics, that natural *mysticism* was produced, which was clearly familiar among the Pagans.

The Divine *Mystique* is first traced in Egypt, among the Ascetics and Solitaries. With exquisite beauty Görres says:—

‘Up to this time the Egyptians had been, so to speak, occupied and engrossed with tending and cultivating death, to render it, in some sort, living, and preserve for it an appearance of vitality. Christianity, on the contrary, preaching, as it did, contempt of the world, seemed to destroy the earthly life by its vigorous mortification. This new kind of life had already had its precedents and models in the prophet Elijah, and in John the Baptist. The solitaries of Egypt followed the footsteps of these saintly personages. Their influence, at that epoch, was more considerable than is commonly supposed. They prepared, in great measure, the way for Christianity in those countries. It is true, that in quitting the world to retire into the desert, they renounced all human interests. But on the other hand, by the empire which they acquired over their savage and ardent nature, they became models, which excited the admiration and astonishment of pagans, and which Christians felt disposed to imitate. The profound change which was accomplished in their beings, under the victorious operation of grace, presented to the world an image of the marvellous effects which Christianity could produce, upon a grander scale, on society universally. As religious and doctors, they have, so to say, continued the psalter. Their life, in this relation, is like the lyre of sacred poetry opposed to the tumultuous epic of history. They have tried Christianity in a lyrical manner, and expressed it under this form. Their whole era bears the impress of being a religious idyll.’—Tom. i. pp. 29, 31.

The introduction of an imaginative and legendary element into the history of the eremitic life is handled by Görres with such tenderness, yet such manly honesty, that we venture to quote several clauses.

‘In this recital of S. Jerome (the story of Paul the Hermit) we already perceive the introduction of legend. The imaginative and poetic instinct of the first solitaries had not been enfeebled by the austerity of their lives. Separated entirely from the world, and from every social relation, like plants which, placed in narrow vases and unable to extend, are forced to develop themselves upward, the first solitaries were obliged to seek a circle for their activity in an upper sphere. Elevated above the forms and instincts of ordinary life, the faculties of their soul expanded in a poetic and ideal sphere. It is recorded that one day Brother Henry visited, as Provincial, a convent of his order at Accon in Palestine, and that after the refectory, he conducted the whole of the community outside the cloister for recreation. Seated in a commodious spot, on the borders of the sea, to the west of the town, they saw a cloud rise from the waters. When that was dissipated, they beheld a mountain appear in its place, on the summit of which was a castle, girt with walls, and flanked with towers. From this castle, a great bridge conducted to the shore. On this bridge a vast number of horsemen and footmen were coming and going. The appearance lasted until sunset, when they saw a new procession of clouds mounting from the sea, which also departed after a time, without leaving a trace behind. This was the phenomenon which has been called the *Fata Morgana*. So is it with legend. It is like a mirage, to which time and place give their form and colour, and which rises from the earth and sports in a higher region. The place which the anchorites inhabited is a vast and arid desert. All these circumstances must have exercised a profound influence upon the imagination of the primitive solitaries, who seeing these various elements under their religious aspect, expressed them as they felt. The echo which disturbed their nightly prayers and meditations appeared to them to be the voices of tempting spirits.

The desert mirage they attributed to the magic operation of the evil one. These images, born in the silence and solitude of the wilderness, and fashioned by the imagination, which was incessantly laying on fresh colours, ended by acquiring a precise and determinate form, and it is thus they have come down to posterity, in simple and pious narratives, upon the exactitude of which the Church has never pronounced.

It is singular that Görres should not have seen the bearing of this splendid passage upon other histories than those of the Anchorites of the Thebaid. Is it only in the wilderness that human nature attaches its own interpretation to casual voices, projects the shadows of its own imagination into the outer world, and colours events with the morbid tincture of a self-deceiving fancy? Had Görres consistently applied the principle involved in these pages just cited, his '*Mystique*' would have shrunk from five large volumes to a moderate pamphlet. Nor is Görres less explicit in his admission of the enormous amplification which has exaggerated the miracles of the desert—an amplification, as he himself reminds us, more easy in proportion as the natural sciences were comparatively unknown. Next after the Ascetics and Solitaries, the Mystic life is developed in the Martyrs. Its three great results are—objectively, invulnerability, psychologically, prophecy and visions.

But *Mystique* is carried out on a large scale in the life of Christian nations. Christian art is one of its results. We shall easily obtain pardon for the insertion of the following passage:—

'The reaction of this historical movement was soon to manifest itself both in science and art. The arts, signed with the sign of the Cross, had penetrated, in the train of the Crusaders, to the furthest regions of the East. Returning into Europe, more richly dowered with science and with inspiration than at their departure, they made an essay of their capabilities. Architecture prepared herself to rear to the Lord temples which should be worthy of Him, after the example of Solomon. A numerous company of artists, united by the ties of association, were scattered over Europe. From the ancient architecture they borrowed its lines, and its forms of admirable simplicity, the circle lengthening out into the column, rising into the air in the rotunda, and assuming the form of a vault in the cupola. These forms seemed to become living when they were penetrated by the vivifying spirit of Christianity. The cube, oval, and equilateral soon developed into the figure of the cross, the fundamental sign of all mysticism. The column, united to other columns, became at once stronger and more graceful, and could be raised to a height hitherto unknown. It seemed to become animate, to pass from the purely material to the vegetable world, and to assume proportions which were rather organic than simply physical. In its ascending movement toward heaven, it was seen to push out branches as it were right and left, and after a long struggle between the horizontal and vertical line, to attain finally the form of the arch. Then these arches, meeting and embracing, produced the ogive, which replaced the ancient cupola. The openings followed the same law. Divided within, and bounded on each side by pillars, surmounted and filled with pointed arches, they everywhere broke the compactness and obscurity of the church, each opening a passage to the air and light, and gave the entire edifice such aerial lightness that it appeared to be emancipated from the laws of gravitation. Sculpture profusely decorated the

interior and the exterior of the temple. These arts also assumed the character of the epoch, and replaced the rude beauty of antiquity, which could not be reconciled with the chaste severity of Christian asceticism, by the grace of vestments, which veiling the lower part of man, seemed to elevate him more nearly to angels, exempt from our perishable bodies. In retaliation, as it were, Christian art devoted itself to bringing out the inner beauty, which lies in the depth of the soul. There is no virtue, and in each virtue there is no shade or degree which has not found its proper expression under the hand of the artists whom it has trained. Antiquity laboured above all to manifest the passions which agitate the heart of man; the primary aim of Christian art is to purify the sentiments and ideas which it expresses. The mysticism of art is especially revealed in painting upon glass. Next, the vast edifices which had been raised to the glory of the Lord, were filled with the pealing tones of the organ, and the chants of the people; for music also had followed the other arts in their development, ever since the invention of counter-point had supplied the law of a richer harmony. All the artistic tendencies of that epoch are expressed in the poem of Tituel, as in a symbol, and the temple of God represents at once the Church and temporal society.—Tom. i. pp. 92, 93.

The Mystic life appears also on a large scale in modern orders, and specially in cloistered Solitaries. The natural laws here do not quite disappear. The difference of sexes modifies the vocation of men and women.

This is succeeded by a very curious and painful chapter on the purification of the nutritive appetite, which seems to us to be Manichean or Gnostic rather than Catholic; nay, Buddhist rather than Christian. If we supposed that the Roman Church was authoritatively committed to it, we should think respectfully of Bishop Newton's application of 'commanding to abstain from meats' in the First Epistle to Timothy. Man's corporal mass presses down, and, as it were, surcharges his spiritual being, says Görres. We are under the 'sad necessity,' to use his very expression, of assimilating to ourselves external substances, to repair the constant waste in these systems of matter to which the living *I* is so closely linked. He goes so far as to say, that 'the Mystic life excludes *all which belongs, nearly or remotely, to the animal kingdom*!' It is strangely inconsistent that he should couple afterwards *milk* with honey, wine and flour, as the appropriate food for the corporal investiture of the saintly soul. Yet, we have here but the embodiment in an over tangible shape of the important truth, that there is a bearing even of our daily food upon our spiritual nature, so that 'whether we eat or drink, we may do all to the glory of God.' How coarse do such super-refined speculations about the indignity of animal food sound before the Divine plainness of Him who tells us that the natural process by which the food 'enters into the belly, and goeth out into the draught,' is the sufficient purification of all meats. And when we read of this 'sad necessity of food,' and 'exclusion of the whole animal kingdom from the Mystic life,' can we help thinking of



Him who ate the Passover in the upper chamber, and on the evening of the great Easter Sunday took 'a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb and did eat before' the disciples?

The mystic life is followed out in various details of what appear pretty nearly mechanical functions—in regulating waking and sleeping, in sickness, in mortifications and penances, in adversity, in works of charity. Phenomena are produced even in the inferior regions of the body. It is gifted with a marvellous suppleness. The motory organs are transformed. The functions of sense are elevated. A faculty is given of knowing the Eucharist at a distance, and of seeing far away. Sounds that we cannot hear fill the ear of the saint. His thoughts are too big for human language, and find utterance in 'unknown tongues.' The perceptions of the beautiful become more exquisite. The plough-share track of truth is daisied over with poetry. An eloquence that burns and pierces falls from the lips. Fra Angelico paints with floods of tears a Madonna, which Michael Angelo says must have been taken from the original. Catherine of Bologna writes down the unearthly music which she has heard in visions. Cædmon, the Anglo-Saxon, and Jacoponi, produce poetry to which the mode in which Coleridge received those musical lines, beginning 'a damsel with a dulcimer,' is common-place. St. Vincent Ferrer can charm the worst and wildest with an influence to which that of the lady in 'Comus' is fanciful and unreal. And these endowments of the saints are crowned with discernment of spirits, gifts of faith, wisdom, knowledge, prophecy, healings, miracles.

We pause for a moment to make some observations upon this portion of the 'Mystique.' This view of the glorification of the spirit of the saints even now, flooding over and silvering the very corporeal organs with light, has much in its principle that commends itself to the scriptural and Catholic believer. But it is, like very many other things in the modern Church of Rome, a coarse draft—we had almost said a caricature—of a profound truth. Rome has a majestic theory of unity; she expresses it in a lath-and-plaster imitation of the heavenly Jerusalem. She has a belief in the dignity of every portion of the corporeal organisation of her saints that sleep, as destined to belong to that spiritual body which shall grow from the germ of the flesh, as the stalk with the glory of its harvest ears grows from the seed that dies; she expresses it in a miserable relic-worship, founded upon wretched legends. And just as she executes the beautiful ideal of the resurrection of the body in the clay of relic-worship, does she carve out the present redemption of the body in the cherry-stones of these fanciful myths. The body of our blessed Lord *after* His resurrection was emancipated, as it would seem, from physical laws. It appears

winged with the heavenward anticipation that plumes, so to speak, His words to the Magdalene, 'I ascend to my Father.' Swift and silent as light He stands in the midst of the disciples, the door being shut. He sails upward from Olivet in His chariot of the cloud. But *before* the Resurrection, it is only once or twice, as on Tabor and when He walks the waters, that His body emancipates itself from natural laws. And so the bodies of the saints hereafter shall doubtless be endowed with faculties unsuspected now. There was a tomb discovered not many years ago.<sup>1</sup> In it were skeletons buried about two thousand years; and under each head there was a block hollowed out, with some seeds deposited in it. These seeds were taken out, sown, and found to be blue-bells. These wonderful flowers are blossoming summer after summer, bending their stalks in the pleasant wind, and displaying their colours in the sunlight. Yet their seeds, and they in them, slept in the grave for two thousand years. The flowers of the field live; the seeds have their resurrection; but the head that rested its aching upon the receptacle of those seeds, the heart that slept upon the sleeping flowers, the body that had been the shrine of a spirit made in God's image, shall they be inferior to these inanimate things? Surely, as the flower is more glorious than the seed, dowered with a wealth of unsuspected colours, and unthought-of odours, the spiritual shall be more glorious than the natural body. Surely if God so clothe the grass of the field, much more shall He clothe us. Or—to take a kindred analogy to the apostle's 'sowing' from the insect tribe—we float on a mountain-lake, and we see a sudden little bubble on the water, and something like a shrivelled bit of the bark of a fragment of stick is left, and the graceful May-fly flits over the waters, luring the large trout from the reeds. Or that butterfly which delights us by the playing of its wings, what was it, and what is it? It was a crawling, slimy, caterpillar. Some months ago it seemed to get rid of eyes, mouth, and even head and back, and became like a mummy swathed in its bands, and self-buried in the earth. But when the spring comes it is the same creature, yet not the same. It becomes from a blind, ugly, grovelling thing, lovely as a rainbow, a tiny emblem of the winged seraphs. Nay, its very faculties of nutrition are transformed. Its sensations hardly rose above growth. Its food was of the grossest. Now it has acquired new sensations, and makes an ethereal nutriment of the flower-cup and the dew. Of course we do not mean to say that there is any positive argument in this. We know that before Christ rose again, thousands of springs had walked the woods in beauty, and whispered of the resurrection through the leaves and round

<sup>1</sup> We owe this illustration to one of Vinet's writings.

the corn-fields, but no human ear understood the voice. Myriads of insects burst their cocoons, and sprung into the air; but no one ever thought that man had any other lesson to learn from them than that which Cowley has so beautifully paraphrased from Anacreon's grasshopper:—

‘Voluptuous and wise withal,  
Epicurean animal!’

But when Revelation has made known to us that God ‘hath raised Him up,’ and promises that ‘He shall change our vile bodies, to be made like unto His glorious body;’ and when S. Paul, in that chapter which the Church reads over her dead, so often recurs to the sweet and vernal image of ‘sowing,’ then we may find witnesses to, and symbols of, that in which we are so deeply concerned, in field and flower, in seed and corn, in blossom and insect. And this glorification of the body, as the Church has ever believed, begins now and here, ‘Know ye not that your *body* is the temple of the Holy Ghost?’ The ancient Church seemed to hold that the Holy Eucharist was the food of this new corporeity formed within the old; and profound and reverent commentators, quite free from ecclesiastical or patristic prejudice, such as Stier, have found this view pervading Scripture anthropology. Certain physical facts, too, perhaps bear upon this doctrine of the beginning of the spiritual body here. The expression of eminently holy faces, through which thoughts seem to be visible like the hands of a clock under a crystal case, to use Dryden’s comparison, or agate pebbles under a sunny sea, to adopt Tennyson’s thought; the change, almost of feature, which so often accompanies the change from sin to God; the gleams which irradiate the countenances of the dying, bear upon a true mystical physiology, which is at present floating in poetry. A thoughtful man, who had seen very many corpses, told us, that with the exception of certain cases of persons dying from some diseases, he had always remarked a peculiar expression on the faces of the holy dead, and that he felt assured that by watching the face for some time, he should know whether the deceased had been a servant of God without further information. Now we think that it is such true *mystique* as this which Rome takes up; and with her *palpablizing* turn, ever bringing down the unseen to the seen—a theological *deductio intellectualis ad sensibile*—with her passion for immediate effect, her uncritical spirit, and her impatience of all that is not definite and dogmatic; disguises in her enormous hagiology.

It was said above that a judicious reader might extract from Görres *aperçus* into obscure phases of mental modifications of which we read in Scripture. We will cite two passages from this portion of the work, in illustration of our remark.

The first is on the difference between mystic and natural somnambulism.

'In the condition of ordinary waking, the movement produced by the organ is imprinted by the will; in somnambulism it is attached to, and depends upon sleep. The intellectual soul withdraws, and is replaced by that inferior part of the soul which has its obscure roots in nature, and is in close connexion with its powers. Hence results that somnambulism in the movements, which, withdrawing them from the direction and control of the will, assimilates them to those blind and involuntary movements which constitute the play of the inferior and merely organic life. This, then, is a species of somnambulism, enclosed within the limits of individuality; while magnetic somnambulism, passing these barriers, places man in immediate *rapport* with exterior nature. But in mystic somnambulism (if the expression be admissible) it is not the base and obscure part of the soul which produces and directs the extraordinary movements that are observed; it is the spirit from on high, which penetrates and fills with its gifts the superior and intellectual soul. In this state the organs are moved by a superior power, and towards a spiritual end.'—Tom. i. p. 309.

This passage, except the unproved hypothesis of a communication with external nature in somnambulism, throws much light upon such conditions as that of Balaam, in Numbers xxiv. and of Abraham, in Genesis xv.<sup>1</sup> It also establishes a criterion of distinction between divine inspiration, and such cases as were gazed at by crowds in the Ulster cabins last year, and treated with superstitious reverence by reverend, fair, and gallant tourists. In both cases, a species of somnambulism is frequent. In both, a physical affection may occur. Balaam 'fell.' Daniel was 'sick certain days.' But there is the important distinction suggested by Görres. An Irish peasant, whom we saw during the revival in a somnambulant state, was manifestly a prey to the 'base and obscure' part of the soul. So far was she from being guided by the reason, or by an external power, that the suggestion of a word or thought by a by-stander manifestly moulded and shaped her thoughts, taking the place of ordinary presentations. Of another in this condition we were told by an eminent physician, that at first her expressions were most solemn and spiritual, but after a while became hideously obscene. That is to say, as long as the impression made by the influence which struck her lasted, her words were tinged with its colour. But when the impression faded, the imagination acquired from the corporeal organization the elements of its creations, when the mind ceased to furnish them by its regular and external activity.

The second volume of Görres leads us into *illuminative mysticism*, the progress through love and divine illumination into ecstasy. A quotation of one or two pages will place us at his point of view:—

'Ecstasy may come from the site of the body or of the soul. In the first

<sup>1</sup> 'A deep sleep—a horror of great darkness.' It is remarkable that the LXX. use the word *ἐκστασις*, so often applied to the heathen seers.

ease, there supervenes a concentration, or contrariwise, as it were a projection of the spiritual part, whether this condition arises from the soul itself, or whether it comes from some exterior influence, cosmical, physical, or chemical. When there is *concentration*, the invisible force which resides in the organs being more completely disengaged from them, gathers itself up within itself, and more easily dominates over them. Hence the intoxication produced by wine and spirituous liquors; the natural ecstasies arising from opium, hyoscyame, and other poisons familiar to schamanism. The fury of the Bacchantes of antiquity, and the Pythian inspiration, were developed by similar means. When the soul, on the contrary, projects itself, so to speak, the dynamic element in the organ is dominated over by matter, and as it were absorbed in it. A state is produced contrary to the first. And this condition also may be developed in two ways, either as a reaction following on the first condition, or of itself by means of certain narcotic substances, or as the effect of some passion. But the initiative of this double condition may also, as we have seen, come from the spiritual part, and is then no longer produced in the baser regions of life, but in the central system. In short, when the mind, whether by itself, or by external impulsions, acquires a surplus of energy, it disengages itself to some extent from its organs, and holds the body more forcibly in subjection. This is at first the state of magnetic somnambulism, which may be the effect of certain dispositions, of certain diseases, of a peculiar manner of living, or which may be produced by the influence of another person. But, on the other side, the mind may be enfeebled in its energies by contrary influences, and placed in a state in which, unable to resist the invasions of the body, it gives itself up to be absorbed by it. Hence the somnolent condition which is produced in different forms, and which may extend to the complete absence of all connected rational sentiments. So far we have considered man only in his relations with the creature. But high above these relations, there is another which links man to God and to the world of spirits, and which is properly the object of our investigation. God, in fact, is always present to man, by an invisible presence, conducting him by a gentle influence which does not interfere with his proper liberty. But He may enter into a yet closer relation with man, and thus produce in him extraordinary conditions. He may draw to Himself that centre of the human soul in which especially resides the Divine image. Thus God becomes to the soul what the soul is to the body; He animates it with his life, as it before animated the body, which is united to it. Thus raised above itself, it enters further and further into the highest spiritual regions, in proportion as it detaches itself from the circle of nature. Not that the soul is placed above the laws of nature and of the moral order, but it fulfils them by love, and no longer by necessity. The body is thus more strongly held by the soul. The senses close themselves, and the body becomes immovable. The internal impulses which concentrate and elevate the life are heightened and quickened, while those which carry it downwards are relaxed and enfeebled. There is as if an ascension of all the powers of man. Thus is formed the mystic ecstasy of the saints, with all its phenomena. But side by side with this blessed condition, where the life, inebriated with God, is lifted above itself, there is another of a different nature, in which the soul, removed from God, and abandoned to its own weight, falls back into the lower world, above which a mightier Power had held it suspended. This is the state of dryness and abandonment which excites such terrors in the saints. If, as S. Augustine says, God is for the soul when it loves Him, what the soul is to the body, and if there is less pain from the soul in ceasing to animate the body than in ceasing to love God, we can understand how painful this condition must necessarily be.—Tom. ii. pp. 52—54.

Here, again, the controversy with Görres will not be in general

principles, but in particular details. Most Christian men—differing from Görres as to the persons in whom these phenomena have been exhibited, and disbelieving or distrusting the accounts of supernatural physical events which have been encrusted round them by Roman Catholic hagiology—will probably consider that this passage, on the whole, is a reverent and philosophical *rationale* of the abnormal condition manifested by those whom we all agree to have been inspired, *e. g.* by S. Paul. And to us, at least, this passage throws something like a new light upon the psychological condition of the Psalmist in those places where he wails forth notes of such inexpressible desolation.

Görres was aware of the magnetic ecstasy, and he distinguishes formally between it and the mystic ecstasy. They are, he says, in spite of several superficial resemblances, essentially opposite. The one is produced by God immediately, or with the co-operation of superior intelligences: the other comes from without by the body, or from within by a factitious inspiration of the soul, and in both cases by organic laws. The mystic ecstasy is the result of sanctity; the magnetic, of temperament and of organization. The magnetic condition is fatal and instinctive; divine ecstasy bears the impress of a loftier consciousness and of a freer will. The natural ecstasy was employed by paganism, especially in the oracles. The mystic ecstasy was reserved for the Hebrew people, and has passed from the schools of the prophets into the Christian Church.

We have before remarked upon the singular inequality in the mental powers of Görres. In the domain of general principles, he is grave, lofty, and philosophical; in the domain of facts, he is childishly credulous. It is in the particulars of the ecstatic phenomena that he most completely astounds us. Thus, in the celebrated cases of the Ecstatica and Adolorata, he uses language which seems calculated to prevent the possibility of overlooking the presence of hysteria. One is not surprised at the *Coleraine Chronicle* speaking of the '*sharp, well-defined cry* of religious conviction,' nor at Mr. Moore's glowing description of the beauty in the countenances of the female converts at Ballymena, for physiology is not likely to have been studied by either of these respectable annalists. Let us just cite one or two sentences from the description of Marie Dominique Lazzau of Capriana, quoted by Görres from the *Annales de Médecine Universelle*:—

'A few moments after she cried, "O my God! what a pain there is in my chest." At the end of ten minutes, she was a prey to the strangest and most horrible convulsions. To describe this access under all its forms, I must say that there prevailed convulsions tonic and chronic, the dance of Saint Guy, partial and general tetanus, convulsive suffocation, coma, spasm, convulsive contraction of the jaws, a species of carphology, and other affections of the same kind. This spasmodic paroxysm presented forms so strange and fantastic,



that it recalled Sydenham's words to the observer: "*Tam diversa sunt symptomata atque ab invicem contraria specie variantia quam nec Proteus luit unquam, nec coloratus spectatur chameleon.*"—Tom. ii. p. 271.

Hardly less honest is the description of Marie Mörl:—

'This excitement, whose focus was probably in the *tissues of the epigastric region*, as was indicated by the species of mania which induced her to gnaw and bite, was accompanied by a new wound, which manifested itself the same day. In fact, pins were perceived in her mouth, and other similar objects, which she gnawed. There were frequently found under or upon the counterpane, needles, tufts of straw, nails, hairs, bits of glass.'—Tom. v. p. 282.

There are few persons, superficially acquainted with the physiology of hysteria, who will not connect the pins and needles with 'the excitement in the epigastric regions,' rather than with *mystique diabolique*. It has been said that if twenty sailors were locked up in any room, they would contrive to be intoxicated in a few hours. And such is the morbid love of exciting sympathy and attention, the 'self-feeling,' in the hysteric patient; such the ingenuity of deception; that pins and needles would assuredly be obtained under the most unlikely circumstances. We have heard from an able physician of one patient who surprised him by producing the most hideous caterpillars, which she affirmed she had vomited; and of another, who subjected herself to great pain, in order to convey the impression that pins and needles had descended from the region of her uterus.

The ecstatic phenomena are, according to Görres, the ecstatic walk, walking on the waters, lifting into the air. The most remarkable instance which he adduces is that of Saint Theresa, who certainly does assert that she had frequently been lifted into the air, by an impulse which she had striven to resist, but against which she was as feeble as if she had been in a giant's grasp. It is curious to mention, that the phenomenon of being lifted off from a seat is said to have occurred to a poor woman in listening to Mr. Scott, the Chamberlain of London, whilst preaching in Antrim last year. Mr. Scott, coyly, but very faintly, puts a 'perhaps' to the miracle; Mr. Wilkinson is much bolder. We must also just mention the liftings into the air which are said to have occurred at mediumistic exhibitions to Mr. Hume and Mr. Squire. It would be more satisfactory, and would dispel unbelieving whispers about wires and gutta percha, if these last marvels took place in fuller light than—

'sub lunc luce malignâ.'

The volumes of Görres which run through the diabolic and natural branches of his subject are so inferior to those which precede, that we pass them over at present.

We now turn to somnambulism and animal magnetism,

which cover so large a portion of modern thaumaturgic psychology. And we consider them specially in relation to epidemic religious convulsions.

Five theories have been broached on the phenomena of animal magnetism.

The first is that of Mesmer—a theory whose absurdity is worthy of the charlatan who was its author. ‘There is a ‘fluid,’ says Mesmer, ‘which is the means of a mutual influence between the heavenly bodies, the earth, and animated bodies. It is so continuous as to admit no void. It is capable of receiving and propagating all impressions of movement. It is susceptible of flux and reflux. Animal bodies participate in the effects of this agent, and it affects them immediately by insinuating itself into the substance of the nerves. In the human body especially, we can detect properties analogous to those of the magnet. We can distinguish in it also opposite poles. The action and the virtue of animal magnetism can be communicated from one body to other bodies, animate and inanimate. This action can take place at a great distance without the intervention of an intermediate body. It is augmented, reflected by glasses, communicated, propagated, augmented by sound. This virtue may be accumulated, concentrated, transported. Though this fluid be universal, all animated bodies are not equally susceptible of it. There are even a very few, which have a property so contradictory, that their very presence destroys all the effects of this fluid in other bodies.’

The second theory is that which was developed by Bailly, in his celebrated report sent into the French Academy, in 1784. He maintains that imagination, imitation, and lassitude, explain the magnetic phenomena. But a candid consideration of facts leads to the conclusion that while very many phenomena can be solved by them, there remain more and more astonishing phenomena, which admit of no such easy solution.

The third theory is an improvement on the first. Certain experimentalists of the last century, and Puységur, Deleuze, and others more recently, explain artificial somnambulism and the effects of passes and manipulations, by the theory of a particular *magnetic fluid* common to all men, which the will can project externally, direct, and accumulate.

The fourth theory is that of the spiritual school, which explains animal magnetism by the direct intervention and presence of spirits. A very interesting exposition of the theory, and an application of it to the phenomena of the Irish Revival, may be found in the seventh chapter of Mr. Wilkinson's book, ‘The Revival,’ which we lately reviewed.

The fifth is the magico-magnetic theory. Of this, M. Dupotet is the hierophant. All we know about it is, that it rejects the intervention of spirits, and explains those astonishing effects by natural magic.

A sixth, or physiological school, has now arisen. It has for a long time been following out its indications quietly, and now seems in a fair way to take possession of the field. The discovery of hypnotism seems to have turned the key of the whole position. The best exposition of the subject is in M. Maury's article, which we follow, with occasional help from other sources.

The Romish Revival of the Convulsionnaires of Saint Médard, and the Protestant Revival of the Prophets of the Cévennes, appear first to have led scientific men to the conclusion that artificial somnambulism is a form of cataleptic ecstasy, an unusual affection, but one which from time to time is produced epidemically. At all events, here were facts fully detailed and untainted by the histrionic element, which seemed to vitiate the performances of professional magnetism. The object of truly scientific inquiries was to fasten upon any reliable pathological facts.

One reliable fact was *sleep* of a peculiar kind. This cataleptic sleep may take place with a sort of seizure that makes the patient immovable. All this time, the action of the heart, the pulse, and the respiration, are in a natural condition. We heard this fact cited by an Irish Presbyterian doctor, as a proof of the Divine character of the Revivalistic affections.

A second magnetic fact is *insensibility*. Two French surgeons in 1846 performed the ablation of a cancer in a woman who had been put to sleep by a professional magnetizer. At the time this must have appeared perfectly miraculous; now that anesthetics are familiar, it does not appear very surprising. An intelligent witness informed us, that, on expressing a doubt, at an American Revival meeting, whether a young man who fell over was not 'shamming,' a bystander suggested that the matter should be brought to a practical issue, by thrusting a pin up one of the patient's finger-nails,—to which cruel test he submitted without moving a muscle.

A third established magnetic fact, and one of the most astounding character, is the prodigious excitation of the intellectual and physical faculties, or at least of some of them. Sudden transfer from torpor to passionate excitement; extraordinary acuteness of sight and hearing; a stimulus supplied to the memory, which sometimes brings out in strong colours lines that had seemed faint and evanescent; these, and similar marvels, accompany the manipulations of the magnetizer, are sometimes spontaneously produced, sometimes propagated epidemically, sometimes follow the use of

anesthetics. Somnambulists and hysterical patients, cataleptic ecstasies, *et hoc genus omne*, are liable to dreams, whose figures are projected, and whose colours are supplied, by the psychical and physical condition of the dreamers, and are the reflections, more or less complete, of their sensations and ideas. Here we have at once the solution of a mass of revivalist wonders, hymns and texts remembered, poetic prayers, passionate bursts of declamation, and visions hideous or ecstatic.

It saves much confusion to classify these abnormal conditions as three degrees of sleep, so to speak. Ordinary sleep may stand for the positive; natural somnambulism<sup>1</sup>, associated as it sometimes is with hysteria or catalepsy, for the comparative; and artificial somnambulism, with its still intenser nervous activity, for the superlative.

It may be well to consider some of those effects of somnambulism, natural or artificial, which most resemble the miraculous.

One of these effects is a supposed transposition of the senses, so that, for instance, it has been maintained that magnetized persons see with the tips of their fingers. But the most profound physiologists consider that nothing has been established which may not be explained by hallucination, and morbid acuteness of the senses.

Again, the vaticination of cataleptics and magnetic somnambulists has often been noticed. They seem to have a therapeutic intuition in their own case, which has given rise to a new species of empiricism, that appears to be making some noise. Nothing, however, has been clearly proved, beyond a strange nervous consciousness of an approaching crisis in the patient himself. We had strong indications last year of the connexion of Revivalist 'cases' with these curious nervous conditions, by ourselves hearing several persons predict that they would be blind, or deaf and dumb, which took place accordingly. And we had yet another indication in the fact that these persons generally were correct in their predictions of the time when these morbid conditions would occur; a marked development of the power of noting time being a well-established effect of somnambulism.

<sup>1</sup> Natural somnambulism can sometimes be induced by an act of volition, though generally upon condition of some antecedent, connected with it by some obscure link of causation. S. Augustine mentions the case of a presbyter, called Restitutus, who, when he pleased, upon hearing an imitation of the voice of a man lamenting, could, as it were, concentrate himself from his sense, and be like one dead. He bore the tests, not only of pinching and pricking, but even of burning, without the slightest movement. Respiration, also, seemed to be totally suspended. During these fits, he could hear voices, if they were pretty distinct, which seemed to come to him from a distance. S. Augustine's acute but singular application of this and other somewhat analogous cases,—such as that of the man he knew who could perspire when he pleased,—will be found *De Civit. Dei*, lib. xiv. cap. 24.

Another very wonderful effect is the communication of the thought of the magnetizer to the magnetized. M. Maury says, 'that the fact to him appears very problematic.' We have no doubt, however, that it is established by overwhelming evidence. We know of a gentleman who has conducted hundreds of experiments. In many instances he has put question upon question to the magnetized person, as to what he saw, and has obtained different answers, precisely corresponding to those images, which he produced by an exertion of his own volition.

Another effect of a marvellous nature, and of which we confess ourselves quite unable to give any solution, which in modern times has accompanied the magnetic somnambulism of religious fanaticism, is the speaking with unknown tongues. We have the testimony of Mr. Baxter, and of other witnesses, that persons under an emotion which they cannot restrain, burst into an utterance sometimes in languages which they had never learned, sometimes in words belonging to no known language, but which, to those said to be habituated to philological analysis, bear all the traces of perfect regularity of inflection. Until these utterances have been subjected to a really rigid critical analysis, that is, to really competent philologists, we shall continue in the attitude of doubt on this point. We heard a rumour that something of the kind had occurred in some parishes of the county Armagh, but we know nothing definite about it. Clairvoyants have at times spoken with, what are called, tongues. The same phenomenon signalizes some of the Roman Catholic saints. The following language from Görres may, possibly, be thought an interesting comment upon that dark verse in the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians: 'He that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him; howbeit in this spirit he speaketh mysteries.'

'The biographers of Saint Elizabeth of Thuringia relate that when near death, she turned to the wall, and, without moving her lips, began to sing again, as if a bird were prisoned in her throat. Thus singing, she yielded up her spirit to her Creator. The soul, in this state, resembles the mysterious column of Memnon, which yielded its sounds to the first rays of the morning. It is like an Eolian harp, which, touched with the breath of the spirit, breaks out in heavenly tones. These outward sounds being but the echo of a profound inward word, it must sometimes happen that this is expressed by words, strange and extraordinary as itself. But in point of fact, this word is not destined to bring the soul into relation with other men; it is not, therefore, surprising that its expression should not always be taken from ordinary language, but should appear to come from a higher world. When the soul enters into the spiritual regions, it must perforce fall in with another order of thought and idiom unintelligible in the usual state of mortality. If the soul would express, inwardly or outwardly, the new ideas which it contemplates, it

is not astonishing that, under certain circumstances which we are unable to account for to ourselves, it should be obliged to have recourse to a new language, unintelligible to others. This happened to Saint Hildegard, who in her visions made herself a new language, and finished by composing a sort of Dictionary, which may be found among the manuscripts preserved at Wiesbaden. Whilst, in many words, it is easy to detect a certain resemblance to German, which was her mother-tongue, the rest betrays an unknown origin. When one studies more closely the formation and composition of these singular words, and compares the procedure of Saint Hildegard with that of the *clairvoyants* of Prévost (and the latter case is quite of a different nature from the first), one can, up to a certain point, account for the manner in which the language was originally formed; one perceives that at first it was the result of a spiritual vision, and that afterwards it has been modified by a sort of vision or ecstasy in nature. In both cases, the language was the faithful image of the interior condition of the nature.'—*La Mystique*, tom. i. p. 364.

So far we have seen the various hypotheses on animal magnetism. We have examined its most remarkable effects, and we have seen that, with the very rare and abnormal exception of unknown tongues—a phenomenon which cannot be said to have been proved—what may be called in the good sense *naturalism* is, on the whole, in possession of the field.

How are the magnetic passes connected with these singular effects? We have indicated the various answers to this question. By the universal fluid, say the mesmerists proper;—by the imagination, argues Bailly, with the contemptuous school, even now;—by the magnetic fluid, exclaim many voices;—by the intervention of spirits, whisper the Spiritualists. An experiment, which has its prototype in the old trick of chalking a line from a cock's bill to the end of a board, and observing his strange reeling cataleptic seizure and cry on waking from his insensibility, seems to have ended in overthrowing all these theories, and substituting another, which makes still shorter work with the magnetic mystics. Let us cite the article on hypnotism, by MM. Litré and Robin, from the 'Dictionnaire de Médecine de Nysten':—

'Hypnotism is the name given by Dr. Braid to the proceeding that he employs to throw a person into the somnambulist sleep. This is the proceeding. Take a brilliant object (such as a pocket lancet) between the thumb and the first and middle fingers of the left hand, hold it at a short distance from the eyes above the forehead, in such a position as shall act most directly upon the eyes and eyelids, and oblige the patient to fix his look upon it. The patient must be made to understand that he must keep his eyes constantly on the

<sup>1</sup> *Experimentum Mirabile*. Gallinam pedibus vinctam in pavimentum deponere: quæ primo quidem totius corporis motu vincula sibi injecta excutere laborabit; sed tandem, veluti desperabunda, victoris de arbitrio aistet. Quietâ igitur sic manente gallinâ, ab oculo ejusdem in ipso pavimento lineam rectam cretâ vel alio quovis coloris genere, quæ chordæ figuram referat, duces. Deinde eam compedibus solutam relinques. Dico quod gallina, quantumvis vinculis soluta, minimè tamen avolutura sit etiam si ad avolandum instimulaveris.—Kireher, *Vis magna lucidæ et umbræ*, Rom. 1646.



object, and his mind solely attached to the idea of that object. It will be observed that the pupils will at first contract, then they will dilate, and after having thus considerably dilated, and also moved in a fluctuating manner, if the first and second fingers of the right hand, extended and a little separated, are drawn from the object towards the eyes, it is very probable that the eyelids will close involuntarily, with a sort of vibration. After an interval of from ten to fifteen seconds, by raising gently his arms and legs, it will be found that the patient is disposed, if he has been strongly affected, to retain them in the position in which they have been placed. If not, he may be asked in a soft voice to keep them extended. Thus, in a short time, the pulse will grow quicker, and the limbs will become rigid, and soon completely fixed; and it will be found that, except sight, all the special senses, comprising those of heat and cold, the muscular sense, and certain mental faculties, are at first prodigiously exalted, as happens in the primary effects of wine, alcohol, or opium. At the same time, after a certain point, there succeeds to this exaltation a depression much greater than the torpor of natural sleep. The special senses and the muscles may pass instantaneously; the first from a profound torpor, the other from a tonic rigidity to the opposite conditions of extreme mobility and exalted sensibility. It is only necessary to direct a current of air on the organ, or organs, that we desire to excite, or the muscles that we wish to make supple, and that had been in a sort of catalepsy. By simple rest, the senses will return at once to their former state. The almost invariable success obtained by Dr. Braid by means of this process, appears in part due to the mental condition of the patient, who is usually disposed to hypnotism, by the expectation that it will certainly be produced, and by the assurance of a man of strong will declaring that it is impossible to resist it. At the same time, when the hypnotic state has been thus provoked a certain number of times, the subject may readily put himself to sleep by looking at his own finger, placed near enough to his eyes to produce a sensible convergence of their balls, or even by keeping himself quiet, and fixing his eyes on a distant point. In each case the fixedness of the eye is the thing most important, although the removal of other stimulants has a decided influence in producing the effect.

'Thus, it is seen, that Hypnotism is closely allied to animal magnetism.'

Let us see how this bears on the naturalism of the phenomena of animal magnetism. There can be nothing magical or spiritual in a bright piece of metal, in a lancet, or pair of scissors. The physiological explanation of hypnotism is, that the act of gazing long upon the object, in a certain attitude, superinduces hyperemia, or, in plain English, fulness of the brain, which is the source of the phenomenon. But how, it will be asked, does this bear upon animal magnetism? Simply thus. The effects being nearly identical, the causes are proportionally identical. The magnetizer's eye acts like the polished plate. Does not this throw some light on the following sentence from a Revival organ?

'The Rev. Mr. Canning describes his preaching as follows: 'he read his text, and made a few remarks; but on looking 'into the countenances of the people, he was struck *with the intensity of their gaze*, for which he could not account. He went 'on for five or six minutes, and at the end of that time a strong 'man in the crowd fell to the ground, as if smitten with a severe 'blow.' . . . We need only add, that natural somnambulism, like

its twin sisters hysteria and catalepsy, is in the highest degree contagious.

III. It only remains for us to add a few words by way of moral.

First, then, it will be a very serious thing in the long run for Christianity itself, if any considerable number of English clergymen be led to endorse Revivalism at all in its full shape. An extreme subjective religionism, as that of the present day is, explodes at last in an Ulster Revival. But be it remembered that the scientific principles which in one generation are the heritage of the few, become in the next the heritage of the many. Unknown, perhaps, as principles, they are recognised as facts. They become ground into the colours of thought and language. They leaven the whole lump of popular conception. They are assumed as primary postulates, with a decision as unhesitating as if they were known by the light of nature. The studies of the physician in physiology, and in that curious branch of it which treats of somnambulism, natural and artificial, hysteria, catalepsy, epidemic mental mania, will soon pass into the popular mind. Just as the diffusion of chemical knowledge in Naples has first exploded the miracle of S. Januarius' blood, and then made men sceptics, so the diffusion of physiological knowledge will explode the marvellous of Revivalism, and if the system become prevalent among us, be the precursor of a similar scepticism. There are not wanting serious indications, that this evil has commenced already.

Again—Should not those men in our Church, who profess opposition to Romanism most strongly, reflect that in the long run Rome has most to gain with their weapons? She has a methodized history and philosophy of the marvellous, beside which 'Years of Grace' and 'Harvest Sheaves' are as a puddle in the field compared with the river that is running over the stones close by. With all the accusations of 'lying wonders' which these men fling at her—and we are not going to defend her—she does employ something like criticism. Which, for instance, of the revivalistic annalists has given any tests so sensible as these three, which Pope Benedict XIV. applies to the direction of divine ecstasy in the third book of his *Treatise on Canonization*? He lays down that ecstasy is not divine and spiritual, if it be (1) periodic, (2) preceded or followed by any natural malady developed from it in the organization, or which comes from without by any sort of contagion, (3) produced by any natural link of connexion between the ecstasies.

Once more. The fact that these movements occur exclusively in bodies external to the Church in every branch of its ancient organization, is no presumption against her, rather the contrary.

At the most, they only prove that some doctrines are popular and influential.

And, finally, to turn away from the subject of Revivalism—Philosophers are now asking whether psychology can be pushed farther? And there is a very general turning on the part of different schools to physiology as the answer. Can psychology thus aided tell us something more of our immortal interests? Can it show us something more of the action of grace on soul as well as body? Can it help us to prolong those bridal moments, in which the soul holds communion with her Saviour and Redeemer? We have before us a psychological journal, in manuscript, written by one not unused to self-analysis, in which the following occurs:—

‘Last night, a singular occurrence. I was alone, and rather in low spirits. A deep dark depression came over me, and a sensation as if a shadow of sin hung over my soul. There was no fear or terror, but the sort of impression that a lowering autumnal sky gives to the landscape—no fear of thunder, but an ugly-looking gloom, that makes the head and almost the heart ache. This lasted for a time. Then succeeded a state to me most unaccountable. It was physical ecstasy. It was connected with religious experience. I could not well say why, but it seemed as if I were floating in air; as if the tension of prayer was merged in a luxurious repose on Christ; as if I was inexpressibly happy. My heart beat as though it would leap through my body, yet I was quite calm. This continued I cannot say how long, perhaps two hours. Yet somehow next morning all this was disconnected from my practical life. It did not bear upon my prayers, nor push me on to do more work.’

How far are such states dependent upon physiological conditions? Here are tangled questions.

It only remains for us to guard against misapprehension. We have been under a necessity of speaking, so to say, *negatively*, in a considerable portion of the remarks just concluded. And, in truth, a system has for years been gaining ground among us, which would uproot sacramental grace and the law of sanctified habits, in favour of a psychological theory of the religious emotions. And as unregulated emotion has a tendency to explode in abnormal nervous disease, it was to be expected that those who consider the emotion supernatural should extend this sacredness to the physical correlative, and exalt it into a visible demonstration of the Spirit's power. It must, therefore, be firmly stated by those who consider such a system of religion on the whole opposed to primitive truth, that the conditions of catalepsy, hysteria, or somnambulism can only be deemed suitable for the reception

of grace, or signs of its presence, by the grossest ignorance or the most grievous fanaticism. In these conditions, it admits not of dispute that the noblest and most divine faculties of man—the intellect and the will—are passive, and that the mind becomes the puppet of the senses. Something approaching to the instinctive life of animals is temporarily substituted for the consciousness of man. The reason acts, when it does act, fitfully and unequally; and if it sometimes may display even a certain splendour, it is a prestigious splendour, like that of the northern streamers, which arises from the flickering play of light as it is tossed and broken by shifting spiculæ of ice suspended in the air. The sentiment of personal identity—the strongest proof of the distinctness of the living immaterial principle from the organized system of matter to which, as Cudworth says, it is so ‘passionately present’—is dormant for a season. In the female constitution, too, a way is opened to the invasion of the lower passions. It cannot be maintained that these conditions are divine, or favourable to the divine life, without practically holding that it is indeed expedient ‘to ascend downwards,’ and that a partial retrogression to the life of animals is an advance to the footsteps of the eternal Throne. These conditions are held to be supernatural, or peculiarly connected with the spirit-world, by the spiritualist and the thorough-going Revivalist, simply because they are unusual.

If, therefore, a desire to combat errors, which only last year were very extensively prevalent, and which seem to be yet rarer in Scotland even now than they were in Ireland then, has forced us to speak negatively, we are the more desirous to proclaim an unhesitating belief in the wonders of supernatural grace in the soul of man. The Divine Breath, which is God the Holy Ghost, is still breathed forth by Him, who in the upper chamber said, ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’ The outpouring of Pentecost still continues undiminished in its own deep channels.

οὐδ' αὖτις  
κρῖναι μνήθουσιν  
——νομάδες βέβρωσιν,  
ἀλλ' αἶψ' ἐπ' ἡματι  
ἀκύτοκος πέδιλιν ἐπιτίσσειται.

Prayer is still crowned with its promised answer, the Holy Spirit is still given to them that ask. All things awful, wonderful, beautiful, that are according to the analogy of faith, we receive with ready acceptance. Around the child of God there are invisible guardians. When a wise and holy man, like Bishop Wilson, inebriated with the strong wine of no fanatical contagion, but calmly reading the Greek Testament with a young

son in the faith, exclaims that he sees angelic forms ascending from the trees, we will ascribe the vision to the unsealed eye rather than to the failing perceptions of senility. When good and sober men tell us of dreams that have been signally blessed, we remember Joseph the carpenter, and that other Joseph, and hold our peace. When effects, similar to those ordinarily produced by habits, have appeared to spring from a single sermon, or a single text, or from some undefinable cause, we seem to hear the sound of the wind that bloweth where He listeth. When joy and peace rise musical and fragrant from a holy life, like odour from the rose, and sound from the running waters, we own the gifts of the Comforter.

Among these and similar gracious phenomena, we believe that a path is still open for a true spiritual psychology. Our Church wants a Görres, imbued with her own cautious and truth-loving character, more sober and discriminating than the German ultramontane. Holy Scripture, the lives of the Saints, a thorough acquaintance with physiology and mental philosophy, a habit of self-study, and a heart acquainted with experimental religion, are the requisites for the task. *Excoriare aliquis!* No doubt that psychologizing is dangerous. One of the acutest of self-observers and metaphysicians has declared his apprehension that the habit of occupying oneself specially with that which passes within one is immoral; because we should give ourselves an external end and support, to act with success on the modifications which we observe; and because we are too apt to believe that all is done, when our self-love is satisfied with some fine observation, or profound discovery in the inner being. In religion the dangers may be very special. All passions and affections (the religious among the rest) *project* themselves to an object. Analysis and self-inspection are fatal to their very existence. To arrest them for inspection is possibly to annihilate them. Their essence is to go out of us, and we draw them in toward us to philosophise upon them. Like the spirit-hands in the stories of mediumistic exhibitions, they vanish when they are grasped, only just letting us feel that they exist. There is the danger also of relying upon them, of assuring ourselves upon our assurance, of holding salvation by our own faith—that is, by an inward work.

Yet manifold advantages would surely arise from a true spiritual psychology, such as we contemplate rather than describe. It would have its physiological side. The bearings of fasting, of music and ritual, for instance, upon the spiritual life, their legitimate use and their morbid exaggeration, would admit of much development. Facts directly confirmative of the teachings of the faith would be brought out into bold relief. All mere systems of anthropology are but partial views of man's wonderful nature. If

man were purely animal and organic, a bundle of sensations wrapped up in flesh and blood, Hobbes and Cabanis are right, and physiology is the proper science of man. If sensation *plus* reflection, according to Locke, or sensation *minus* reflection, according to Condillac, make up man, then verbal logic is our all-in-all. But the simple fact is, that man, according to these two schools, is as truncated as Condillac's own ideological mannikin. Bishop Bull was no psychologist, yet his 'Discourse on the State of Man before the Fall' has heights which Locke never reached. There is spirit in man, as well as Locke's soul, and Hobbes' body. Above man who eats and drinks, makes money, syllogizes, there is an inward man, who lives not 'by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the 'mouth of God.' Reminiscence, suggestion, association, will account for a multitude of thoughts. The disciples of Hobbes or of Locke may tell us that every thought is connected with another by a link of association so fine and delicate as frequently to defy analysis, yet as really existent as in the case of him who, in a conversation on the civil war, abruptly asked the value of a penny.<sup>1</sup> Mental philosophers may—

—'crowd the intellectual sphere  
With mazy boundaries, as the astronomer  
With orb and cycle girds the starry throng.'

Peace, and joy, and sensible sweetness in devotion, may be more or less physical and organic, or dependent upon physical and organic conditions. Yet after all, and making the largest allowance for the obscurity of the regions in which thought moves, there are thoughts and moods of whose origin no mental or organic physiology can give account; there are regions of the spiritual and intellectual heaven whose boundaries no merely scientific psychology can determine. Man's power over the world of thought is confined within limits strictly analogous to those which restrict his dominion over matter. He can compound and dissolve, he can modify that which is given, but he can neither create nor annihilate a single particle. Whence, then, these mysterious thoughts tending to the infinite, these wonderful yearnings towards the unseen, this gazing of the spirit as we kneel at the Holy Sacrament through the window of time to the heavenly Jerusalem? There is one only solution: it is the

<sup>1</sup> 'In this wild ranging of the mind a man may oftentimes perceive the way of it, and the dependence of one thought upon another. For in a discourse of our present Civil War, what could seem more impertinent than to ask (as one did) the value of a Roman penny? Yet the coherence to me was manifest enough. For this thought of the war introduced the thought of this delivering up the King; the thought of that brought in the thought of the delivering up of Christ; that again, the thought of the thirty pence: thence easily followed that malicious question; and all this, in a moment of time; for thought is quick.'—*Hobbes, of Man*, chap. iii. 'Of the Consequence or Train of Imagination.'



water, given by Christ, that 'is in a man a well of water springing up to everlasting life;' a presence, external to and separate from his nature, mental or physical, yet lodged in the very recesses of his being; and as water rises to its level, bubbling and leaping up<sup>1</sup> to its living source, even to Him who is the life's life of spirits. A deaf man, who should occasionally be enabled to hear sounds; a blind man, who from time to time should have his eyes opened, would not attribute such sights and sounds to illusion. He would attribute them to external, objective realities. And if the ears and eyes of our spirits be ever and anon opened to sights and sounds that make exquisite music to us, and open to us a holier world, even though these gleams be transient, and that music too soon be interrupted, it is true philosophy to believe in an objective reality, the origin of that which we cannot create, while we have a reasonable foundation for believing that other spirits, and we ourselves, too, under more favourable circumstances, may enjoy continuously what we now only enjoy at interrupted moments. And so we learn to think of ourselves, as of men walking behind sandhills, and aware of the existence of the ocean by the constant hum and roar of the tide, but who are soon to come to an opening through which we shall see the shining waters. It will also be found that the most extraordinary results of psychology present analogies which illustrate the teachings of faith. For instance, we ourselves consider that there is proof for a psychological law of *sub-introduction* of thought from the magnetizer to the magnetized. Does not the existence of such a law, not indeed explain, but at least illustrate, the communication which exists between superior spirits and ourselves? Nay, may it not tell us something of the transmission of thought (with reverence be it spoken) from the Divine Spirit to man's, which changes and reverses character, and of which S. Paul says, 'We, with open face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.' Once more, such a psychology would prove the inadequacy, at least, of that popular system, which confines the work of grace to bringing the soul through terror of the law to a felt consciousness of pardon. But a further development of this subject would exceed our limits, and still more our studies and our abilities. Let us conclude in the words of a great proficient in the spiritual life: 'The senses and the imagination have no part in the peace, and in the communications of grace, which God makes to the intellect and to the will, in a simple and direct manner which baffles all reflection!'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> πηγή ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—S. John iv. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Fénelon, *Maximes des Saints*.

## NOTICES.

THE last number of the 'National Society's Monthly Paper' is worthy of close and careful attention. It appears from it that the 'unostentatious' process, with which we were made well acquainted some years ago, is still in full vigour in the Education Department of the Privy Council. We cannot too earnestly impress upon the Clergy and upon the Church at large the absolute necessity of proportionate watchfulness. We speak deliberately when we say that any clergyman who accepts 'Conscience Clauses,' and allows 'my lords' to erase from the trust-deed the clause which provides that the Managing Committee shall consist of members of the Church of England, is, under present circumstances, a traitor to the cause of Church education. There is a busy and mischievous man who now presides as Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education. In his place in the House of Commons he has said very little in defence of the system which he has been appointed to administer, but he has twice declared his hostility to the fundamental principles of the Concordat now existing between the Church and the Education Committee: once when he expressed his innocent desire to 'amalgamate the staffs' of inspectors 'on the score of expense,' and to have but one staff of lay inspectors visiting all schools alike, and as a necessary consequence ignoring religious teaching in their examinations; a second time when he complained of the 'exclusive' religious character impressed upon schools by managers. The National Society has done its duty in respect to Llanyspyddid, Llandaff, Llanarf, Llanelly; and we exhort managers who are afflicted by 'my lords' recommendations and threats to apply to the National Society for counsel and aid. If the old battle must be fought again, *it must be fought*. The 'unostentatious' scheme must not be allowed to win at last. The Colchester case, to which the *Guardian* has called attention, is likely enough to become typical, unless school managers are instantly and generally on the alert.

A 'Church History of the First Three Centuries' (Dana) has been published by Dr. Milo Mahan, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary, New York. We can congratulate the author on having accomplished his task with great success. The tone is good, the facts are condensed into a small space, and the style is free from the blemish of Transatlantic inflation. A useful chronological table is prefixed, and a short analysis on the margin accompanies the text. The growth of a native ecclesiastical literature in the United States is a healthy sign of Church progress and strength which we note with pleasure.

'How We spent the Autumn; or, Wanderings in Brittany' (Bentley), by the authoresses of 'The Timely Retreat,' whatever else it may want, is not deficient in interest and vivacity. The authoresses, not, perhaps, without very valid reasons, have not initiated us very deeply into the history and antiquities of Brittany, or supplied us with any very novel or striking information on the peculiar habits and customs of the people, but they have mostly confined

themselves to a narrative of their own personal adventures. We do not profess to have read their book with very deep attention, but, cursory as our perusal has been, we have fallen upon some very awkward inaccuracies and blunders. At p. 169, the authoresses speak of 'timbres des postes,' and at p. 244, of 'Notre Dame de bonne voyage.' At p. 68 we read of researches after a 'canotte' and its crew, and at p. 275 of 'deep seas of mud, which compelled Nora and I to mount.' At p. 42 we are introduced to a certain Monsieur de Souvestre, a gentleman of whom we certainly have never heard before (though his name is given correctly enough in other places), any more than we have heard of the M. Villemarqué twice mentioned in Appendix A; neither have we ever been regaled with 'café noire' (p. 300), or got into the 'intérieure' (p. 79) or the 'coupe' (p. 312) of a diligence, whatever these young ladies may have done. Again, it is stated at p. 155 that the 'mâcles' of the Rohans are still on the columns of a church at Pontivy; and, at p. 197, we are informed that the following inscription is placed on the portico of the great Chartreuse at Auray: 'Gallia merens possuit,' and, further, that an expiatory chapel is built close to the 'Champs des Martyrs;' whilst at p. 57 we are assured that Clisson is twenty-one miles from Nantes. We regret also to perceive that the logic of our authoresses is not always superior to their grammatical, orthographical, geographical, and other knowledge. *A propos* of Clisson, we have the following passage (p. 61):—

'Our guide this time was a man, *concierge* of the place, very well informed 'apparently, and with an astonishing memory for verses. At each point of 'sight he repeated endless lines, more or less clever, composed by the various 'visitors to the place. It belongs to a Monsieur le Mot, whose name affords 'a subject for many with which to point their rhymes. It is difficult to recall 'a verse, however striking, that you have only heard once, but I will try just 'to illustrate his style. The ground at our feet was strewn with acorns, and 'something was said about their being the best possible food for pigs. "Ah! 'that reminds me," said he, "some one said—

' Il faudrait mettre un chêne  
Pour l'arbre de la liberté,  
Car ses fruits nourrissent sans peine  
Les animaux qui l'ont plantés'" (sic).

It is not very clear to whom *he* and *his* always refer in this passage. It contains, in addition, more than one inaccuracy. As to the lines given, they are not quoted correctly; neither were they originally *said*, but *written* in a book kept by the *concierge*, in which are inscribed the names of the different visitors to the Garenne. The whole is a clever *plaisanterie*, but the ignoring altogether of the circumstances under which they were written deprives them of their point. They are to this effect, and they follow up the remarks inscribed in the book by a previous visitor to the Garenne of the name of Le Goarant de Tromelin, in reprobation of the Republic of 1848 and its authors:—

' Ils auraient dû mettre un chêne pour arbre de liberté,  
Car son fruit nourrirait sans peine les animaux qui l'ont planté.'

If these lines do not scan, they are at least clever and grammatical. We do not wish to be hard upon the young ladies, but really they should write with more care. In spite, however, of these and other blemishes, their work is very

readable; and though, as far as the actual amount of information contained in it is concerned, it is not perhaps worth taking with one as a companion in a trip through Brittany, one may while away pleasantly enough one or two hours in its perusal.

The Oxford 'Prize Poem on a Sacred Subject,' awarded triennially, has been gained by Mr. Alexander, of Brasenose, for 'The Waters of Babylon.' It is an obvious criticism on Mr. Alexander's poem to say that it would not have been written had not Tennyson's 'Idylls of the King' preceded it. To which a sufficient reply is, that we may be very thankful that so good a model has had so able a successor. Mr. Alexander's flowing rhythm, refined diction, and delicate appreciation of external nature, which render his illustrations as true and precise as photographic transcripts, give us reason to hope that he will take a place among the sacred choir, which is not at present overcrowded. We trust that this poem will have a longer life than many of the pretty ephemera which sparkle on the Isis; and as we perceive that Mr. Alexander is beneficed in Ireland, we have no doubt that the personal influence of one who combines so much of elegant literature and sound learning—as the phrase used to be—will have its effect in a sphere where, as in the Church of Ireland, the great virtues of zeal and activity sometimes lack the relief of academic learning and polish. Nor are Mr. Alexander's qualifications confined to poetry: and we are not without hopes that he may some day give fuller and deeper results of his reading in a more permanent shape than that of a fugitive poem to the Church.

'Trevenan Court' (Masters) is a religious tale, inculcating, among other valuable lessons, the great Christian virtues of self-denial and self-sacrifice. The plot is good, though simple, and the details are skilfully executed. It may be urged that some of the topics introduced are occasionally rather deep for a work of this nature, and the conversations somewhat discursive at times; but there can be but one opinion as to the general scope and character of the work; and it would be difficult for any one to rise from its perusal without deriving some benefit from it, and without forming the highest estimate of the writer's heart and mind. Without ambitious aims, without the slightest attempt being made at fine writing, many passages exhibit considerable power of thought and language; the characters of the chief personages of the tale are admirably delineated, and some of the descriptions of physical nature strike us as peculiarly graphic and beautiful; while the work, generally, inculcates the most elevated views and feelings, and the soundest religious principles. We have a high opinion of this book and of its gifted authoress, who is evidently capable of great things, and who, we venture to predict, will, with care and perseverance, eventually occupy a prominent place, in more than one department of literature, among the writers of the day.

It has been very much the fashion of late years among many of the most eminent French *littérati* to collect together their different essays and reviews scattered in the magazines and periodicals of the day. What M. H. Rigault, so suddenly called hence and with the finest prospects before him, has been unable to do for himself, his *collaborateurs* and friends MM. Saint-Marc Girardin and Mesnard have done for him. M. Rigault's works, issued by M. Hachette, are comprised in four goodly octavo volumes, and they well deserve being

collected and republished. Indeed, we have seldom met with volumes of French essays that have pleased us more. To this edition of M. Rigault's works is prefixed a short but gracefully-written biographical and critical memoir from the pen of M. Saint-Marc Girardin, who has left it to M. Mesnard, the well-known professor, and author of 'A History of the French Academy,' to publish a more detailed and elaborate life of their common friend. Most of M. Rigault's reviews and dissertations originally appeared in the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique*, and in the *Journal des Débats*, and they embrace a somewhat diversified range of subjects—religion, philosophy, criticism, classical literature, education, history, poetry, biography, &c. M. Rigault seems to have been a man of a very cultivated and superior intellect; he was endowed with much largeness of view, had great and varied learning, was an acute thinker, a close reasoner, and a vigorous writer. But not only was he a very talented writer, he was also a man of high principle. M. Rigault was for some time Professor of Latin eloquence at the *Collège de France*, and private tutor to the Comte d'Eu, eldest son of the Duke of Nemours.

Mr. Wm. Heygate's manual for the Clergy, 'The Good Shepherd' (Rivingtons), though it cannot be said to supply a deficiency in our theology, yet, as a devotional work, and one well suited for recalling the pastor to his duties and responsibilities, is in some respects better suited to present necessities than even Herbert or Wilson.

In many, and those serious matters, we fear that we should have to differ from Mr. Hampden Gurney, but we have always felt that his 'Sermons,' of which the third series (Rivingtons) is published, have a vigour and sensible character, which, without displaying much novelty or very deep theology, are especially suitable to the existing form of society. In sermons generally we miss any peculiar adaptation to things as they are: sermons should reflect the age,—should be in the world, though not of the world.

One of the Minor Canons of Southwell, Mr. J. F. Dimock, has edited with great care a MS. metrical life of S. Hugh, of Lincoln (Lincoln: Brooke). It forms an elegant monograph. Bishop Hugh was a repetition of S. Thomas of Canterbury; and though he acquired less fame, or rather more of a local fame, his character is quite worth studying.

Miss Rosa Raine is the authoress of 'Rosa's Summer Wanderings,' a work we have not chanced to see. She has made a very needless Autumn Wandering in the 'Restoration of the Jews' (Masters), which is only a small-paper edition of Charlotte Elizabeth's heretical speculations. What an odd thing it is that two ladies should feel so deep an interest in a Judæo-Christian Church retaining all the Jewish ordinances!

Mr. Neale's able 'Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, containing his Reasons for abrogating the Twenty-ninth Canon' (Masters), should be read generally, and especially by those, and they are many, who concur in Dr. Wordsworth's able argument on the other side of this important question.

Mr. W. B. Flower's translation of the 'Apology of Theophilus' (Masters) is not only creditable to him as a scholar, but it is also interesting and important as a specimen of what is not common in our communion, a version of the early

defenders of the Gospel. Though under different circumstances, something may be learned, in the coming contest for the fundamentals of the faith, from the first Christian apologists.

Mr. Cayley, the translator of Dante, is really a poet, but his 'Version of the Psalms' (Longman) strikes us as being ludicrous. We have over and over said that the Psalms are incapable of translation into English poetry. Mr. Cayley, though he uses strange and archaic language on principle, does not induce us to unsay our verdict. The odd phrases used in this version remind us of the inexplicable, but very common, process of speech which we generally adopt with foreigners; if we cannot speak their language, we talk in bad English, on the theory that our own broken language is more intelligible to a Frenchman. We can assure Mr. Cayley that his bad English, and his cross between prose and verse, is not a bit more like Hebrew than Tate and Brady. Here is a whole paragraph, Ps. lvii. :—

- '5. Daily my words they wrest;  
'Their thoughts to do me scath are all address.
- '6. They lurk, they congregate,  
'They dog my heels; to snatch my life they wait.
- '7. Shall they in doing fraud  
'Escape? Destroy the people in thy wrath, O God!
- '8. Cast up my wanderings,  
'Put by my tears; doth not thy book record these things?'

'Our English Home' (J. H. and J. Parker) is an anonymous work, but it is written by a sound and learned archæologist. It contains the annals of our English civilization, and all about our progress in social and domestic matters, how we came to be the family and people which we are. All this forms a book as interesting as a novel, and our domestic history is written not only with great research, but also with much spirit and liveliness.

A second edition of Mr. Neale's 'Deeds of Faith' (Moxley) is announced, and at the same time we receive a German translation, with the title of 'Werke des Glaubens,' under the editorship of, and with a commendatory preface by, Dr. Fehldram, Provost of S. Hedwig's, Berlin. (Berlin: Jansen, 4, Zimmerstrasse.)



# INDEX TO VOL. XL.

(NEW SERIES.)

## ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Abingdon [*Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*,  
§c.], 1—42.

B.

British Association [see *Oxford*].  
Broglie, Prince Albert [see *Emperors*].

C.

Communions, Evening [see *Evening*].  
Congregationalism [*The Congregational Year-  
Books*, §c.], 82—103.

E.

Emperors, the First Christian [*L'Eglise et  
l'Empire Romain*, par M. A. de Broglie],  
130—100.  
Essays and Reviews, 327—385.  
Evening Communions [*Evening Communions  
—a Tract*, §c.], 191—214.

H.

Hurd, Bishop [*Kilvert's Life of Hurd*, §c.],  
262—302.

K.

Kalendars of the Church [*Day Hours of the  
Church of England*, §c.], 386—418.  
NO. CX.—N.S.

M.

Missions, Wants of the Church's [*Reports of  
the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*,  
§c.], 63—81.  
Mosaic System, Theory of the [Olshausen and  
Ebrard on the Epistle to the Hebrews, §c.],  
419—450.

N.

Nursing, Notes on [*Miss Nightingale's Notes*,  
§c.], 104—129.

O.

Oxford, British Association at [*Temple's Ser-  
mon*, §c.], 237—261.  
Oxford, its Constitutional and Educational  
Changes [*Burrows' Pass and Class*, §c.],  
303—326.

R.

Revivalism and Thaumaturgic Psychology  
[*Publications by M'Ilwaine, Gibson*, §c.],  
451—479.  
Rome [see *Sardinia*].

S.

Sardinia, the Roman See and [*Philippo Strozzi*,  
§c.], 215—231.  
Story Books, the Moral Character of [*Works of  
Fouquet*, §c.], 43—62.

L L

## SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

**JULY**—Corroda Abbey, &c. &c.—Barrau's Histoire de la Révolution Française, 1789-1799—Archer Gurney's Sermons Anglicans prononcés en chaire—Des Principes de la Réformation en Angleterre, compiled and edited by Dr. Godfray—Bingham's Eighteen Sermons on Easter Subjects—Dumbleton's Sermons on the Daily Services—Stier's Words of our Lord Jesus—Bengel's Gnomon—Sir Emerson Tennent's Ceylon—The Marriage Law Defence Association—The Declaration by the Ten Thousand Clergy against Lord Ebury's Motion—Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible—Hewitt's Ancient Armour.

**OCTOBER**—The National Society's Monthly Paper—Dr. Milo Mahan's Church History of the First Three Centuries—How We spent the Autumn; or, Wanderings in Brittany, by the Authoresses of The Timely Retreat—Alexander's The Waters of Babylon—Trevenan Court—M. Rigault's Works—Heygate's The Good Shepherd—Hampden Gurney's Sermons—Dimock's MS. Metrical Life of S. Hugh, of Lincoln—Miss Rosa Raine's Restoration of the Jews—Neale's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, containing his Reasons for abrogating the Twenty-ninth Canon—Flower's Translation of the Apology of Theophilus—Cayley's Version of the Psalms—Our English Home.

